

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 428

IR 006 374

AUTHOR Haywood, C. Robert
TITLE The Doing of History: A Practical Use of the Library-College Concept.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 132p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; *Case Studies (Education); Changing Attitudes; *Educational Theories; History; Learning; *Library Role; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Library College

ABSTRACT

Discussion of the Library-College teaching concept and several case studies demonstrating its application in the teaching of history are provided. This book focuses on the first of the four building blocks on which the Library-College method is developed; it deals with ideas which justify, or prove, the Library-College concept in a philosophical way. Here one deals with the major and minor premises of the idea, the reasons for its goals, and why these goals seem valid in human terms. These ideas are developed through several accounts of how teachers have implemented the Library-College. Each approach is entirely different but all lead to the same result: the student learns by doing. The library becomes the laboratory where students gain hands-on experience. They become involved in the making of history, in this way viewing history as something that is on-going, not completed, to be looked back upon. With the use of this concept, history as a field of study may be rejuvenated, reversing the trends of the past decade. (MBR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED161428

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE DOING OF HISTORY

A Practical Use of the Library-College Concept

By C. Robert Haywood

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wilma J. Pennington

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM "

The Library-College Associates, Inc.
Norman, Oklahoma
1978

IR006374

CONTENTS

Editor's Foreword	vii
I. If The Need Exists	1
II. Doing Versus Taking It	17
III. The Serendipitous Entrapment..	32
IV. Putting the Library-College to Work: A Discussion	61
Appendix: A Selected Bibliography ..	111

*One must learn
By doing the thing;
For though you think you know it
You have no certainty,
Until you try.*

Sophocles

Editor's Foreword

You Find It in the Learner

Where can I go to see a Library-College?"

"What schools are using this Library-College idea?"

"How big a grant does it take to implement the Library-College?"

"Whose approval does it take to try a Library-College experiment?"

To educators who have spent the last several years trying to promote the Library-College concept within the educational system, the fielding of such questions has become a ritual. They come up at all meetings, conferences, and workshops which the Library-College holds,

and they dominate discussions and coffee-break exchanges on the value of this concept. They even form a part of the educational literature.

As might be expected, most of these questions come from those who are new to Library-College thought. And given the way most educators think, it is probably only natural that teachers in this group should ask these kinds of things. Indeed, any other questions would seem uncharacteristic, for most have grown accustomed to working in a system that relies for its efficiency on interchangeable parts and standardized procedures. Thus, they limit their horizon to use of those ideas that lend themselves to copying.

It is, then, understandable why questions of this kind might seem to be in order to most teachers, media specialists, and administrators who are new to Library-College thought. Their thinking tends to run toward recipes and models, and only incidentally toward personalizing growth. Conversely, it is equally clear why teachers who have thought about this concept look upon such questions as "Where can I go to see a Library-College?" as futile to consider and useless to explore.

Some would even say they do more harm than good. All would claim they have little if any pertinence to Library-College goals.

Perhaps the biggest problem in dealing with these questions is that anyone who tries to answer them forthrightly has to do the job by going about it backwards. It seems to be inevitable. The very act of speaking to questions such as these necessitates defining the Library-College concept by telling what it ISN'T.

There are, of course, certain advantages to taking this approach. For one thing, it always makes apparent that the Library-College ISN'T a separate institution, or isolated project, which educators visit as they do a Montessori school or an "experimental" college. For another, it has a way of causing all but the most cantankerous to recognize that budgets, subsidies, and grants have little if any pertinence to using this idea. It even lets some see that teachers can adopt a Library-College method entirely on their own.

Clarity on these points is absolutely vital. In fact, nothing is more crucial, for confusion on these questions keeps too many teachers from seeing that this concept has practical application. Accord-

ingly, these "negative" introductions do serve a useful purpose.

But as useful as they are, nothing takes the place of a positive explanation. When this is given it soon becomes apparent that teachers and librarians throughout the United States are using this idea in local schools and colleges. And this is just the beginning. With such an explanation most can see quite clearly that Library-College methods are pertinent to every discipline, and to every kind of student. Equally important, few are in much doubt that Library-College methods lend themselves to use in classroom situations.

In discussing several examples of how these methods work, Robert Haywood, author of *The Doing of History*, and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas, focuses on one of the four foundation blocks of this concept. As all readers will discover, a complete understanding—as well as a full appreciation—of what this means depends on knowing something about these different blocks, and how they come together.

The first of these four blocks is made up of ideas which justify, or prove, the

Library-College concept in a philosophical way. Thus, in studying this component one deals with all the basic considerations in this concept, including its major and minor premise, the reasons for its goals, and why these goals seem valid in terms of human needs. An entire work on this subject will soon be appearing in the *Learning For Living Series*.

Since study of such questions indicates that people have to deal with problems by handling myriad stimuli, the second block in this foundation concerns the nature and potential of total communication. This block, which is known as the *Generic Book*, is in turn closely related to the third construct in Library-College thought, namely, the *Communication Way*. Essentially, this concept concerns the unifying elements that tie together all human and material resources in such a way that any learner can gain access to the complete range of man's recorded knowledge. Gaining skill in using these connections is the key to solving problems in a self-directed way.

How a learner builds this skill is what interests most observers of the Library-College. In pointing this out it should

also be stressed that some of these observers confuse the work of mastering the Communication Way with using a formula or recipe that leads to set results. For this reason it must be said again that there is no one prescription, formula, or recipe insofar as the Library-College is concerned. Indeed, the very idea implies a contradiction in terms. Consider the facts. By definition a Library-College approach means personalizing study, not forcing every student through preconceived routines.

Because *The Doing of History* skillfully develops this idea in connection with several accounts of how actual teachers have implemented the Library-College in their own schools, Robert Haywood's discussion of these efforts is as interesting as it is enlightening. He shows, for example, that each of these approaches has been entirely different. Moreover, he is careful to point out that they have been so for a reason, namely, students in each school have different needs and problems, and as separate human beings with individual worth all have personal goals they are wanting to attain. Accordingly, catch phrases such as "mastery learning" or "competency-based education" never

played a part in any of these methods. The emphasis was entirely on giving every learner the freedom to develop in responsibly autonomous ways.

Among the more interesting of these descriptions is one which Robert Haywood himself once carried out. In presenting this description, the author makes it clear that his approach excluded assignments which entail "use-of-the library" lessons and orientation drills. This too is significant, for by purposely avoiding these wasteful and feckless chores he enabled every student to concentrate on building skill in use of tools while learning how to think in terms of solving problems. In other words, Dr. Haywood let the student utilize a method that prompted him to do evaluative thinking while learning how to handle the Communication Way.

While Robert Haywood's approach is only one way of implementing the Library-College, it is an important way. For one thing, it is applicable to all levels of the system. For another, it is one that can be used with every kind of media. For still another, no one resource is predominant, except as individuals prefer a favorite tool. Finally, it lets the student be the one who truly "does" the learning.

The combined effect of all this involvement with self-selected tools has several consequences. Of these, perhaps the most immediate is the fact that every student comes to know the meaning of feeling what he learns. Related to this, and no less crucial, is the fact that all can actually experience everything they study. Finally, and perhaps most important of all, each begins to see the overall significance of learning how to learn.

Outcomes such as these are rare in education. Even so, they are attainable in every school. Moreover, they can be attained by every student, for as Robert Haywood explains, gaining these results depends on nothing more than using those approaches that let all learners grow by "doing" what they learn. Active involvement, of course, implies a laboratory, or work-type study environment, and when students have the freedom to exploit this potential they can study in a way that leads to personal outcomes. The Library-College calls this personalizing learning.

A method of this kind makes little if any use of the authoritarian lecture. This is not to say that a one-way presentation is automatically forbidden in Library-College thought. On the contrary,

a well-developed lecture by any human resource—particularly if this person qualifies as either a bibliographic-minded subject specialist or a disciplinary-oriented librarian—always meets a need in some particular student. In addition, it often prompts discussions among small groups of students, and even acts to interest some learners in a problem for lengthy periods of time. Lectures of this kind are part of the Generic Book.

But in spite of this potential, most one-way presentations are highly ineffective for individualizing study. The reasons for this are obvious. Anyone who limits his teaching to the lecture keeps his students focused on a narrow range of data that everyone must master. Furthermore, it is a meager amount of data, for no lecturer can impart more than he is capable of putting into words in a given amount of time, such as a 60-minute class period. And what is worse, these data all appear in a take-it-or-leave-it form, regardless of the differences which any class of students regularly show in terms of aptitudes and interests. In short, most lectures fail to meet individual differences.

As opposed to this, a Library-College method enables every student to find and

learn to deal with the widest range of data, and to do so through the use of all five human senses. This too is important, for it means that every student has much more chance to learn. No longer is he limited to thinking which is prompted by what he sees and hears.

To appreciate this point, as well as its implications, one only need observe how little education challenges any student to learn through *all* his senses. In general, stress is only placed on those of sight and sound, with touching, feeling, and smelling receiving little notice. Perhaps the easiest way to gauge just what this means is by noting the importance which teachers give to reading. In education, nothing else comes close to challenging its significance.

While the Library-College has no trouble with this fact, it doesn't make a fetish of reading just for reading. Rather, it stresses how this skill relates to solving problems. *The Doing of History*, for instance, shows that in a Library-College method reading is primarily a means by which the student can reach a personal goal. Never is it thought of as a self-sufficient end. In other words, reading by itself is nothing but a skill, and when it

is devoted to such materials as Harlequin romances, pulp-type comic books, and sensation-oriented tabloids it may be serving purposes that hold back one's development. Nor is this all. Even the reading of quality materials has minimum importance unless the reader is engaging his mental powers and energy, not to mention his emotions, in the content of each page.

To some people, statements of this kind indicate that the Library-College is only for the genius, or at least the highly motivated who like to think in academic terms. Hopefully, a careful reading of the two parts which make up *The Doing of History* will put an end to such ideas. And well it should, for Robert Haywood is careful to point out that the goals of the Library-College pertain to every learner, regardless of his age, ability, or attainment. This means they are just as pertinent to the elementary student as they are to the graduate scholar. They are also just as basic to the academically slow as they are to the intellectually gifted.

Implementing the Library-College, then, deals mainly with problem-solving — not just reading, or handling hardware, or even using libraries. It is not, however, the kind of problem-solving that students

usually do in teacher-imposed assignments. Far from it, for as used here the term refers to growth that only comes about by devising new hypotheses, trying out solutions, and seeing what they mean when thought of in connection with new configurations and unknown situations. Learning how to do these mental operations takes effort, time, and patience. It also takes persistence and considerable self-control.

Use of the Library-College does not, of course, guarantee that a student will learn. Nor should anyone assert that it does, for as mentioned above, learning is a process which no one but the student can ever set in motion. In short, the student is in charge of what he actually learns. To admit this, however, is not only to point out the obvious, but it is also to underscore the fact that NO method, regardless of what big name is behind it, can guarantee that learning will automatically result from using certain methods.

In saying this it is recognized that some methods—such as those involving electronic machinery and color-coded reading materials—do seem to make such “guarantees.” On examination, however,

it becomes clear that the "learning" they refer to is little more than changes in observable behavior. And while such changes can be measured through before-and-after tests, everyone can see that learning such as this rarely if ever 1) creates a solid basis for self-directed thinking, 2) motivates the student to generate real feelings, and 3) leads to understanding by seeing how the practical relates to what is theory. In brief, it is just another form of behavior modification.

From all this it should be clear that any implementation of the Library-College starts with the idea of facilitating the total growth of human beings. The two main contributors to *The Doing of History*—Robert Haywood and Patricia Knapp—have long been identified with such a view, the former through his work as both a teacher and administrator, and the latter by virtue of her success with the Monteith College Library Experiment. Beyond this, both have long been identified with the Library-College, its founding and development.

Unfortunately, the untimely death in 1972 of Patricia Knapp cut short her contribution to this concept. Even so, countless educators across the country still

study and implement the ideas of this illustrious teacher, and even more will do so in the future. The result will be a better educational system. It will also be appreciably—even strikingly—more humane, for students at last will have a chance to do their studying in a personalized environment. Nothing could be better as a testament to her influence.

All those who have studied the works of Patricia Knapp will have no trouble seeing that the essence of what she worked for—and what Robert Haywood and others are still promoting—is described here in *The Doing of History*. Her program was comprehensive, yet in true Library-College style, it started with the notion that the student must be free to develop on his own. In today's world this understandably tends to sound a little trite. Nevertheless, to Mrs. Knapp this concept had real meaning, and she put it into practice by letting every student develop skill in handling 1) the different forms in the literature, 2) the surface clues which lead a learner from one tool to another, and 3) the bibliographic guides which tie the Communication Way together.

In pointing all this out, it should be stressed that Patricia Knapp opposed any

effort to build this skill in a vacuum. For this reason she would despair of the various use-of-the-library exercises which certain educators now are trying to promote. Nor would it matter to her that these attempts now carry such fancy sounding labels as "library instruction," and "user education." To Patricia Knapp, the use of tools made sense only when the student learned this skill while "doing" the solving of a problem. It is a basic consideration. So basic, in fact, that it led her to devise the Communication Way.

The Doing of History demonstrates that educators in the typical school system can put this construct into use. It also shows that when a team of teachers do this, learning usually follows. Even more important, it indicates quite clearly that those who do this learning "experience" their achievement. For the educational system this smacks of revolution. The school is finally able to let each student think in other terms than merely reacting and reciting. As Robert Haywood says, "What the student learns, he masters on his own."

Howard Clayton
Norman, Oklahoma
1978

I

If the Need Exists

The teaching of history has fallen on hard times. For some this is a difficult fact to face. Still, it cannot be denied. The evidence is all about us.

As part of this evidence, findings from a survey of colleges and universities which the American Historical Association conducted in 1974 indicated that on a national basis enrollments in undergraduate history courses were down by more than 12 percent, and that in some sections of the United States this figure was as much as 23 percent.¹

¹"History Courses Losing Students," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 9 (September 23, 1974): 7.

Further evidence of history's fall can be seen in the fact that the Organization of American Historians *Newsletter* tried to find optimism in a more recent survey that showed a trend in which only "slightly more than one-third" of the colleges and universities had little or no enrollment change and no more than "about the same number" reported a decline. This, however, would appear to lend only modest comfort, for during the four-month period from February through May, 1977, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*—the current barometer of college job availability—ran only fifteen announcements for instructional positions in history, and many of these were one-year, non-tenured track assignments.²

So far as history is concerned, then, there is no steady state. On the contrary, there is an absolute decline in the number of students as well as a concurrent reduction in the size of faculties instructing these smaller enrollments. Attrition in faculty ranks due to retirement, death, promotion to administrative positions, and other catastrophes is failing to keep

²The months of February, March, April, and May 1977 were used as these would appear to be peak recruiting months.

up with the reduced demand caused by declining enrollments. No probationary position is secure, and the frequency of reported declarations of financial exigency is causing twinges of nervousness among even the most entrenched, tenured, associate and full professors.

The situation is grim; so grim, in fact, that David Sarasohn, in an essay entitled and advocating "Zero Historian Growth," confesses that he and his fellow Ph.D. graduates in history have the "employment prospects of a chariot mechanic." "At one California university," he explains, "there are more history graduate students than there are teaching jobs in the entire country, and according to one higher education journal, these lush prospects will end in the 1980's when academic job openings will decline 80 percent."³

This is all very troubling and all very new. For many decades history departments were in quite a different position because they offered three academically important services: 1) supplying compulsory general education requirements, 2) maintaining the "content discipline" for secondary teachers, and 3) providing cog-

³David Sarasohn, "Zero Historian Growth," *Harper's Magazine* 251 (July, 1975): 92.

nate courses for other majors. Although the faculty of these departments tended to think they were primarily preparing professional historians, the number of such students was always small. In fact, this number was so small that the prospective professionals were, at best, never any more than fourth place consumers.

In offering these services, history departments were meeting a practical need. Furthermore, this need seemed to have a valid base, for almost everyone felt that an "educated person" should know something about the march of civilization and the story of his country. High schools, usually bolstered by local and state statutes, traditionally required a certain amount of history in every pupil's curriculum. Similarly, colleges and universities usually included a freshman course in history, typically under the name Western Civilization, in their package of liberal arts requirements, for it was thought that this would produce "the well-rounded individual" or "the whole man" who would emerge at one end of the diploma on Commencement Day.

The result was huge sections of freshman-required Western Civilization courses, generally taught by graduate as-

sistants, which kept the body count high enough so that the senior professors could maintain small seminars for the prospective professionals. If there were five sections of 100 to 200 students in Western Civilization, the 20-to-1 student-faculty ratios required by state legislative budgeting formulas were no problem, even with a 3-6 hour graduate teaching load. It was a good life for senior professors.

The first of these services, then, contributed to both the health and the wealth of the history department by supplying students, regardless of their major. As the college enrollments grew, so did the history department's courses, faculties, and budgets.

The second of the important, highly practical, and credit hour-producing functions was that of supplying the content discipline for secondary teachers. While it is true that school boards and principals traditionally assumed that "anyone can teach history" and that "anyone" frequently was the football coach, nevertheless there always was a steady flow of consumers who needed a major or minor with certifiable history content for their secondary education credentials.

The last of the three services, pro-

viding cognate courses for other majors, was the least productive of the three functions. It had the added drawback of requiring a certain amount of mutual back-scratching. That is to say, if the Political Science department was to continue to require six hours of United States History, the History department could be expected, in turn, to require some reciprocity, say three hours of American Government. It was a kind of mutual empire building.

In retrospect it is easy to see why all these services resulted in a favored position for history departments. Nor is it hard to see why this position became so steeped in law, tradition, and inertia that it seemed nothing short of a revolution could change it.

Yet change has taken place. Moreover, to many teachers of history who are caught in the present depression it indeed has been a revolutionary change, for somewhere in the campus unrest of the 1960's the posh and privileged life of many history departments came to an end. Each of the major functions which had sustained that good life was adversely affected during that decade.

The general education requirement was the first to feel the effects of the tur-

moil of that period. Putting the student on his own to choose from the smorgasbord of freshman offerings which characterized the new requirements saw a rush away from the assembly line, mass-produced history classes, and as this took place the need for college history teachers declined with classic supply and demand precision. The total number of history instructors, so cleverly tied to the 20-to-1 ratios of the historian's heyday, declined with the passing of each hiring season. Eventually some unfortunate senior faculty who thought they had seen their last freshman were once again teaching the "Surveys."

The role of supplier of cognates suffered to a lesser degree from the same concept of freedom of choice that decimated the Western Civilization sections. Compulsion even in the major requirements was not considered a sound pedagogical or socially accepted practice in a free society. Although departments were less likely to relinquish control over their majors, there was some loosening of requirements even there.

The high schools were not far behind the colleges. Soon the old, legally mandated position of history was being ques-

tioned, and as this continued an effort was started to reduce or eliminate history as part of the high school's social science requirements. In its place a variety of more "relevant" courses was suggested, and in the last few years a number of these have steadily grown in popularity. Economics, for instance, is considered by many to be more essential. The function of the Federal Reserve Bank, the impact of taxation on the law of supply and demand, and the causes of inflation are seen as more immediately relevant to students than the election of Martin VanBuren, the causes of the War of 1812, or even the discovery of America.

To compound matters, high school enrollments now reflect the lull before the World War II Baby Booms' babies arrive on the high school scene. The precipitous decline in student population in the 1980's will be of a magnitude great enough to adversely affect teacher-demand even if history manages to retain a somewhat protected position within the curriculum.

In summary, three major factors—the opening up of general education options, the weakening of the secondary school's history requirements, and the slowing down of the burgeoning student population—have put history, as a class-

room discipline, back on its own merits. History must justify its existence without the force of state and institutional law. Considering the present state of the art, that is a prospect which must be viewed with pessimism.

The gloom deepens when one considers the nature of the students now coming to the universities. Here, I am not referring to the alarming decline in LSAT and ACT scores, a circumstance which can no longer be explained away as an aberration of the testors. Nor am I referring to the unhappiness and discontent of the young. Fortunately, that frame of mind which is dissatisfied with the status quo is always with youth. What I am referring to is the state of mind in all of America which Daniel Boorstin calls the "imprisonment of the present." As a nation, Boorstin believes, we are:

Overwhelmed by the instant moment—headlined in this morning's newspaper and flashed on this hour's newscast—we don't see the whole real world around us. We don't see the actual condition of our long lived body national.

Without the materials of historical comparison, having lost our traditional respect for the wisdom of ancestors and the culture of kindred nations, we are left with little but abstractions, utopias, to compare ourselves with. No wonder, then, that some of our distraught citizens libel

us as the worst nation in the world, or the bane of human history. For we have wandered out of history.⁴

It is certainly true on campus. Students have more than wandered; they have rushed out of history classes.

It is also true that history, second only to literature, feels the effect of the Marshall McLuhan generation's aversion to the printed page. For too long history has been the book; it has been reading. After all, it is historical dictum: No records (frequently interpreted as books); no history. For many, the words of one disparaging professor are all too descriptive of today's students: "They watch well but they don't read."

The selling of a college education as if it were a resaleable commodity has also hurt history, as it has all humanities. For years college recruiters had reinforced the middle class conviction that a liberal college education was worth X number of dollars per year to the graduate. In a persuasive article entitled, "Where College Fails Us," Caroline Bird pointed out that freshmen in 1956 could expect to realize a 12.5 percent return on their college in-

⁴Daniel Joseph Boorstin, *Democracy and Its Discontents; Reflections on Everyday America* (New York: Random House, 1974), pp. 45-46.

vestment. By 1974 this return was no longer likely. She cites the hypothetical case of a young man whose rich uncle gave him in cash the total cost of four years at Princeton. The amount, \$34,181, included what the young man would have earned if he had gone to work right after graduating from high school instead of going to college.

If he did not spend the money on Princeton, but put it in the savings bank at 7.5 percent interest compounded daily, he would have, at retirement age 64, more than five times as much as the \$199,000 extra he could expect to earn between 22 and 64 as a college man, rather than a mere high school graduate. And with all that money accumulating in the bank, he could invest in something with a higher return than a diploma. At age 28, for example, when his nest egg had reached \$73,113, he could buy a liquor store, which would return him well over twenty percent on his investment as long as he was willing to mind the store. He might get a bit fidgety sitting there, but he would have to be dimwitted to lose money on a liquor store, and, for the moment, we are talking only about dollars.⁵

Bird's fictitious Princeton example also assumes that the Ivy League graduate would secure a position requiring a de-

⁵Caroline Bird, "Where College Fails Us," *Signature* 10 (June, 1975): 60.

gree in history. That assumption, in itself, is becoming for many college graduates the greatest fiction of all.

Interestingly, as the market value of a liberal arts education declines, the new college students have come to expect a career or vocational pay-off from their post-secondary education. The job crisis of the 1970's has led them to demand specific job benefits with their diplomas. History offers fewer direct saleable talents to a variety of careers than most disciplines. Even foreign language faculties can claim they offer added skills for overseas or foreign trade options to business majors. Few would deny the value and virtue of historical study as glorious assets for lawyers, businessmen, ministers, and a myriad other quite profitable professions. But there's the rub. All these possible careers require further time and training; all use history only as a point of departure. With few exceptions—archival work, park service, legislative research—history has depended for direct application upon history, i.e., historians teaching other historians. As has been explained, there is already an abundance of that sort in the halls of any graduate school.

It is admittedly a depressing recital

of woes. It is doubly so because the cards all seem to be out of the historian's hands. The deck is being dealt by outside forces. The rule-making bodies in colleges, high schools, and state governments seem to conspire with nature, birth rates, and student fancy to drive Cleo from the shelter of the Ivory Tower. Yet there remains as much need for the understanding of the past as there ever was. To return to Boorstin:

We will not be on the way to curing our national hypochondria unless we first see ourselves in history. . . . We have nearly lost interest in those real examples from the human past which alone can help us shape standards of the humanly possible. So we compare ours with a mythical Trouble-Free World, where all mankind was at peace. We talk about the war in Vietnam as if it were the first war in American history to which many Americans were opposed. We condemn our nation for not yet having attained perfect justice, and we forget that ours is the most motley and miscellaneous great nation in history—the first to use the full force of law and constitutions and to enlist the vast majority of its citizens in a strenuous quest for justice for all races and ages and religions. . . . Beneath the strident voice of the present we must try to hear the insistent whisper of reason. It does not sound "with it." It speaks only to the attentive listener. It speaks a language always unfamiliar and often archaic. It speaks the

language of all past times and places, which is the language of history.⁶

Boorstin's conclusion is that we must escape the imprisonment of the present and begin to perceive ourselves in the perspective of time or we will flounder on the rocks and crags of democracy. In short, we need a knowledge of history.

The justification for rum running in the Prohibition Era lay in the folk wisdom: "If there is a need, some one will fill it." What's good enough for booze ought to be good enough for history. The problem is that Boorstin speaks from the position of "ought"; the young history graduate faces the future of reality—from the position of what "is."

Fortunately, this has not totally demoralized all prospective historians. A recent number of the *University of North Carolina Alumni News*, for example, featured two young graduates who are still willing to venture into the area of the humanities. The young historian was guardedly optimistic: "The hard luck stories about unemployment are not enough to make me quit. . . . It's survival of the fittest in some ways." He reasoned that

⁶Boorstin, pp. 46-53.

there has been "a ridiculous lowering of standards" and, since he was confident, able, lucky, and well-prepared, a job would materialize. The other graduate was less certain, but more philosophical. If the job market remains tenuous, he might move to other efforts, but in either case, he did not feel that his time had been wasted.

If you want to make some generalization about students of the mid- to late- '70's, it's that we really think that things are going to be tough, period. Maybe that kind of frontier mentality insulates you against such ideas as being cheated. These are not personally passive times; there is a very great general uneasiness that animates any passivity. For students, there is almost the expectation that your expectations are not to be realized.⁷

Although both young men realize the odds are against them, each is willing to take a chance that in the years just ahead so many students will see the need for history that jobs will develop. It is a fine, stiff-upper-lip point of view, and while such thinking is commendable there is more to their, and other young historians', dilemma than just the decline of total secondary and college level enrollments.

⁷ Margaret L. Weeks, "They're Going on for Ph.D.'s Despite the Overcrowded Field," *University of North Carolina Alumni Review* 15 (May, 1977): 8-10.

There remains the challenge of convincing those students who are in school that there is a compelling necessity to study and to know man's past.

II

Doing Versus Taking It

At present few will deny that the teaching of history has acquired a poor image. The young Carolinian quoted in the preceding section said as much, but he inferred rather than specified the case. It is fairly easy to demonstrate that students should find history interesting. It is equally easy to demonstrate that many are not fond of the way it is taught in today's schools. Both high school teachers and professional university historians have been guilty, although for different reasons, of frequently and blatantly denigrating historical instruction.

History department faculty can no

longer ignore their responsibilities to their profession as both historians and teachers. The day is past when the historian-teacher can treat a faculty assignment as a sine-cure and regard with arrogance and sophistry the instructional obligation his role demands. We can no longer accept J. H. Hexter's vision of the teacher-historian:

The most important consequence of entry into the society of historians is that the entrant is thereafter called upon to write history. To get history written is the only unique purpose of the society, the only trait that unmistakably distinguishes it from other similar societies. To get history written, not to get it taught. Academia itself usually makes teaching a condition of employment for professional historians, and since there are few other paying posts available to them, they teach willy-nilly, usually willy, but sometimes nilly.⁸

One of education's elder statesmen, Edgar Bruce Wesley, in an article with the chilling title, "Let's Abolish History Courses," describes the "face of history" as seen by a student in the public schools.

To pupils history appears to be a mixture of narration, description, and implied, if not al-

⁸J. H. Hexter, "Doing History," *Commentary* 51 (June, 1971): 55.

ways expressed, conclusions. Some of these fore-ordained conclusions, set up in the name of law, patriotism, national security, and civic virtue, do violence to logic, truth, and common sense. Touched now and then with color, sincerity, and appeal, school history is, however, generally catalogic, tedious, and irrelevant. Students learn slowly that they have to study history because the law, the school board, the administrators, the teachers, and the patriotic organizations say they must. Learning under duress has been repeatedly demonstrated to be wasteful, frustrating, and provocative of hostility and sullenness. The colorful pictures and the wonderful maps in the textbooks do not save the content from being dull and dry. School history fails because it is selected content set out to be learned for preordained purposes. This face of history is not very appealing.⁹

The face is truly distressing. Yet somehow the formal, scholarly description does not have the bite to it that the simple but more direct language of the suffering student has. The *NEA Journal* presented a high school student's candid reaction to history. In its entirety, the essay reads:

The school subject I dislike the most is history. First of all, I can see no reason for studying this subject as I will probably never use it once I am out of school. Another reason for my feeling

⁹Edgar Bruce Wesley, "Let's Abolish History Courses," *Phi Delta Kappan* 49 (September, 1967): 8.

toward history is that it is so dull and uninteresting. There is no challenge to think things out or draw conclusions. All the facts, the dates, names, and places are stated in the books. Then all this information must be memorized. Since there is no logical reason for one event to follow another, the only way to remember the lessons is by long study sessions every night of the new information and constant reviewing of old notes. Since I find history so boring and hard to learn, I prefer to take as little of it as possible.¹⁰

There is no mistaking the degree of hostility nor the enrollment implication for college level history courses. "Principles of Economics," "Introduction to Criminal Justice," and "Biology for Nurses" need fear no competition from "Western Civilization" or "Survey of United States History" in the college plans of that student. It would also appear to be hard to mistake the reason for the student's aversion. Yet, by way of rebuttal, the writer's high school instructor criticized the student for not recognizing the relevance of the past to her present life and, particularly, for not being able to catch, at the mere mention of the date 1492, a "technicolor projection of Christopher Columbus

¹⁰"1066, 1492 and Student 49631," *N.E.A. Journal* 55 (October, 1966): 22.

on the deck of a small boat," in short, the glamor of the event. This, of course, missed the gist of the student's complaint, one apparently echoed by many college students. The point the student essayist was trying to make was that history was presented as a cut and dried, illogical series of unrelated and uninspiring events. No mystery and no challenge! These are devastating charges against history as it is currently viewed by high school students —and, if I'm not mistaken, as it is seen by many college students as well.

Admitting that the charges are all too often true, the guilt lies not with the discipline, but with its presentation. No mystery? Impossible! The first task of the historian is to discover the unknown and his second is to clarify the unclear. His most useful assets are a natural curiosity and a suspicious mind. He looks on any accepted version of an historical occurrence as a snare and a delusion where half the events are undescribed and half the motivation unrevealed. He has more in common with Erle Stanley Gardner than with the accountant or scientist. As for static, inflexibility of content, Peter Geye has succinctly demolished this myth by

describing history as "argument."¹¹ The "revisionistic historians" have all long since been revised. Only the dates are fixed, the rest is in flux.

If that is so, how can one accept the high school student's evaluation of history? Simply put: The excitement of history is for those who "do" history. Most American high school and college students do not "do" history. Instead, they "take" it. They take History 101 on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at 10:00 A.M. There they "hear" history and, if they are compulsive or inordinately conscientious, on occasion they "read" history that someone else has already "done." But mainly, like one-a-day vitamins, they "take" it because it is good for them since it fills some unknown, prior deficiency that the doctor (in this case, a Ph.D.-type) has determined they have.

There is little wonder the student disparages the discipline; he doesn't know what it is. The fault lies not in the student but in the instructional method. While it is true that the teacher-historian cannot control nature and birth rates, he can im-

¹¹ Boyd C. Shafer, "The Study of History in the United States; Some Affirmations and Some Doubts," *A.A.U.P. Bulletin* 50 (September, 1964): 239.

prove the image of the discipline which most assuredly can use a good face lifting. If the teacher-historian is seriously interested in changing students' attitudes, he can turn to improving instruction and instructors. And so we turn.

The first assumption must be that it is the student who is important. And even then, since we are in the business of education, it is the student's learning that is paramount. As hackneyed as the phrase is, we need to be reminded repeatedly that it is not good instruction, not good lecturing, not good testing, not good authorship, that makes for good education, but rather good learning that should command the attention of educators. Whatever the technique is, if learning takes place, we have succeeded. Having accepted the obvious, we must next determine what is to be learned.

The assumption that good education means good student learning is a primary educational premise that is all too frequently violated in the existing high school and college history course. For, although the purpose of required history is generally spelled out by the institution in appropriate student attitudinal goals, the actual course sessions become strictly con-

tent oriented. Historical periods are to be "covered." Content must be committed to memory. Furthermore, it is preordained content in which: "All the facts, dates, names and places are stated . . ." The fluid, undefined nature of historical "fact" and historical method becomes lost in the emphasis on the rigid, fixed aspect of historical knowledge. In too many instances, the instructor becomes so hopelessly submerged in the presentation of data he fails to convey the tentative, exploratory nature of the discipline.

To attack this fossilizing condition, the teacher must first discard the old concept of "a fund of knowledge," that mythical irreducible body of facts, values, and understandings that all who call themselves educated must have mastered. If there ever was such a fund, the burgeoning of books and learned journals, the proliferation of recorded facts, the revision and re-revision of interpretations, and the spawning of new fields of study have made such possession an unrealizable goal. There would be, for instance, the problem of delineating which of the interpretations of, say, the American Civil War, or which characterization of Jeffer-

son would go into the fund-bank to be memorized.¹²

Once freed from the confinement of content, however, the teacher can begin to present history to the student as a way of organizing his thoughts, a way of thinking, an approach or technique for attacking the problem of understanding the human condition. It becomes a way of "doing" something with what we can find out about the past. In Professor Wesley's words: "... teachers become directors of research rather than hearers of lessons, the students must become producers as well as consumers of history." He advocates "history sources, not courses." In short, the student needs to become involved in the process. Only then can history be viewed as something incomplete, as something to be cultivated so it will

¹²The futility of defining the "irreducible content" of American history is discussed in a recent *Newsletter* of one of the largest organizations of American historians. The conclusion was that the latest effort of the 1976 *Times* Survey of Historical Knowledge was "clearly inadequate" revealing "the survey to be politically partisan, sexist, and concerned more with the present than the past." James Hantula, "The New 'Irreducible Content' of American History," *Organization of American Historians Newsletter* 5 (July, 1977): 7.

grow, and not as something already finished which needs only to be consumed. The student needs to handle the discipline as if it were alive and not something completely documented, determined, and dead. In Jacques Barzun's words: "There is besides the facts, a sense of history which familiar handling develops, very much akin to that by which the lumberman knows wood and the art expert Michelangelo."¹³

I would quarrel with Wesley's conviction that we need to abandon courses, even the traditional period courses. For example, mathematics is the kind of using, handling, doing subject which has both content and a substantial literature. But can one imagine College Algebra presented as content alone, through lecture, discussion, or even the latest electronic gimmickery? Can one imagine equations being explained fully but the student never being allowed to "work" his own set of problems? No mathematician is committed to any specific equation; $3x - 5 = 22 + x$ is no better as a problem to be solved than $7 + 4x = 97$. It is the stu-

¹³Jacques Barzun, *Teacher in America* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1954), p. 100.

dent's mastery of the process, the mathematical way of thinking, that is the goal. Understanding comes with "working" the equation. The fact that it is a course has little relevance to the procedure.

Harold Taylor puts the proposition eloquently:

Where the traditionalists are wrong is in not making a distinction between experiencing history and learning about it. The theory of the educational tradition bases itself on the psychological mistake of thinking that being presented with historical accounts of past events is the same thing as gaining a sense of history, that a knowledge of what has been thought, said, and done is the same thing as knowing ideas by thinking them, that knowledge of the good leads to a concern for the good, either in action or in thought. It is only by acting upon life, shaping it, learning from it, creating a life and a knowledge of one's own, that the individual can gain the values of education. That is why it is false to separate educational methods from educational content, and to assume, with the traditional educators, that the educational end has been reached when a body of accredited knowledge has been assembled in a curriculum and communicated to the student by the conventional devices.¹⁴

Although Taylor carries the criticism and

¹⁴Harold Taylor, *Students Without Teachers* (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1969), p. 101.

cure beyond the classroom, he does confirm the folly of assuming that passive hearing assures acceptance and understanding.

If one can accept the idea of history as something to be done, there are still certain pedagogical myths to be exploded. Of these, one of the most encrusted is the conviction that there is some sort of pre-ordained or natural sequence in the ordering of history courses. The student needs a broad survey of how the United States developed before a course in the American Revolution, and both are a prerequisite for a research course in state institutions. College departments have built empires on that myth. Under its careful nurture warm bodies do get into classrooms, and the ratio of faculty to the number of students does look good to the Dean. It is dogma that will die hard.

In actuality all history starts in the middle and is interrupted before it ends. Historians have carefully insisted upon that generalization. If you go back too far in time, it is archeology; if you come too close to the present, it is political science or sociology. All beyond the pale. Since it is never complete, one period, one span of time is as good as another, es-

pecially if the objective is to "do" history and not memorize an established fund of knowledge.

Another problem arises in crediting students with enough sophistication to do history. There is an inclination on the part of professors to believe that "one cannot do history until one has an awareness of the sequence of previous events and latter ramifications." If not given the right facts, in the right order, the student will mess up the conclusion. Unfortunately, from the point of view of many teachers, the student never quite accumulates enough of the "right" facts nor has enough historical acumen to be allowed into the mystery of doing history. In the bitter words of Samuel Shermis:

While it is perfectly true that critical thinking does not take place in a vacuum, the notion that students must first be "given" the facts and then, at some distant time in the future, they will "think" about these facts is both a cover-up and a perversion of pedagogy. It is a cover-up because teachers seem to have no desire ever to allow students to think about the material; students never seem to reach that magic point where they have enough facts to think. That point is always ahead of them—in the ninth grade, in the eleventh grade, in college, or in graduate school. The claim, therefore, is simply

a justification to continue the practice of requiring rote memory of historical information.¹⁵

The secondary school teacher of history has his own peculiar problems. Not the least of these is the growing demand that his instruction meet a set of prescribed "social science objectives." One of the sources of the current attack on history's inclusion in secondary curricula centers on how history fits into social science. It is questioned, in part, because of the traditional understanding of history as a discipline with a predetermined set of facts, figures, and accepted conclusions that do not necessarily conform to an equally rigid set of social science objectives.

The objectives of history, however, could well be stated in perfectly acceptable social science terms, such as developing an awareness of the way societies undergo perpetual change, gaining an appreciation of the fact that events do not occur in isolation, coming to the conviction that there are discoverable forces which shape society, realizing that individual events are unique, and learning to see that individual personalities may help shape—but rarely control—the direction of history.

¹⁵Samuel Shermis, "Six Myths Which Delude History Teachers," *Phi Delta Kappan* 49 (September, 1967): 9-12.

The "Growth of Self-Awareness" has even been demonstrated to be a possible contribution, although hardly the usual goal of an historian in a class discussion on the Election of 1860.¹⁶

The historian's goals could also be stated in methodological terms, such as fostering the scientific method, stressing analysis, devising models, formulating patterns, or developing problem-solving attitudes. Indeed, historians may even concede the "Behavioral Objectives" that educational psychologists see as significant social science objectives. When these objectives are carefully stated, it soon becomes obvious that one period, or one era of history, or even one biographical study can be as important as another. The meaning of this is clear. The best way to acquire either methodological or social science objectives is not by memorizing static dates, facts, and interpretations, but by doing history.

¹⁶Humphrey and McCreary who outlined the objective went on to explain: "Ideally, one would 1) define criteria for what should be learned in history courses; 2) translate these into precise course objectives; 3) measure student learning in a course through careful pre-testing and post-testing; and 4) evaluate the success of the teaching in that course by deciding, in light of what was learned in the course, the extent to which the objectives were achieved." David C. Humphrey and Eugene C. McCreary, "Evaluating the Teaching of History," *Liberal Education* 56 (December, 1970): 519-520.

III

The Serendipitous Entrapment

Having cleared the air of several myths and slaughtered an appropriate number of sacred cows, it is time to refrain from generalizations and philosophizing and get down to cases. To do so let me interject some personal testimony.

My own instructional itinerary in teaching students to do history began with the term paper. I knew I had to motivate the student, and I felt any student alive from the neck up would be amply stimulated by my sparkling, even brilliant, lectures which ticked off the causes and the effects of momentous events with a synthesis of contemporary scholarship that

was as thorough as it was entertaining. As for "doing history," I let the student pick a topic and "do a paper."

Doing history through a term paper, which should have been the perfect wedding of novice historian with the library, turned out to be a shabby and brief courtship with little likelihood of health issue. Critical thought, general awareness, and historical sensitivity simply did not emerge. What I got was a collection of facts and muddled interpretations taken from a few magazine articles, a couple of monographs, and an outdated encyclopedia. Meanwhile, back in the classroom where the real action was, I continued to enlarge on the five causes of the Mexican War and its seven results. If it was not totally self-fulfilling, it was better than the incompatibility of student with the term paper. Eventually a divorce was decreed; after all the student still had the seven causes and five results (or was it five causes and seven results?). He was learning my history, if not his.

Somewhat less frustrating was my flirtation with paperbacks. If the term paper did not turn the students on, then I proposed they buy their own library. Seven or eight judiciously selected paper-

backs are no more expensive than the normal five pound textbook, and is about all one can really expect the student to read well during one term. With their own library tucked neatly away on their own shelves, as far as I was concerned, my beginning students were at least exposed to differing historical interpretations and each learner could then come to his own thinking about the conflicting accounts. They would consciously or subconsciously be doing history.

The students still did not seem to rise to my expectations. They failed to become truly involved with the subject. Nor did a change to the so-called "source books" do much to alter this condition. As such teaching aids were produced, the instructor was confronted with three choices: 1) a collection of miscellaneous documents moving chronologically through a period with a preamble of a treaty here and a letter from some well-known diplomat there, followed by proclamations, bills, and personal letters; or 2) a collection of conflicting secondary accounts interspersed with a few contemporary writings illustrating the conclusion drawn in the former; or 3) a collection which presented the relevant sources on a minor historical

event, but then ruined it all by a three page summary of the whole episode.

The crippling weakness of all three choices is that they either do the work for the student or fail to present sufficient material for the student to see how historical conclusions can be drawn. As a teacher, I had to admit that they gave neither depth nor breadth. The students on their part tended to see them as the same sort of static authorities as their textbooks only in changed format, or they perceived them as recording a rather meaningless debate similar to those of the two leading advertised products that quarrel over the whiteness of dirty T-shirts.

At this point, I began to look with envy at my colleagues in chemistry. They had a laboratory which forced even the freshmen to "do" chemistry. This seemed to me to be the heart of the matter. If one is to have the students "do" history, they must have a laboratory.

Fortunately, the historian's laboratory is not as prescribed as the chemist's, and equally fortunate for the beginner, it is cheaper and scattered within easy reach all about us. It is only when the practicing historian reaches graduate sophistication that the laboratory requires

the kind of expenditures and facilities usually associated with retorts and nuclear magnetic resonance spectrophotometers. On any other level, however, it need not be so. The normal high school library and a few electronic devices will do quite well. As a matter of fact, some innovative high school teachers and librarians have discovered they can provide excellent laboratories with surprisingly few resources. Imagination, not grants or gadgets, is the key.

Examples of outstanding projects which students have completed in the typical high school library are easy to find. One that comes quickly to mind was described by Richard F. Newton in the October 1973 issue of *Clearing House*. It has all the elements that go into the "doing" of history, yet it consists of nothing more involved than enabling each student to use cassette recorders, community resources, and local documents to develop a history of his own school. In short, it lets the learner be the one who does the learning.

In describing this project, Richard Newton correctly observes that no school exists in a social or political vacuum. "The

school, to a large extent, is a reflection of the society that surrounds it." While the content of the project is of a smaller magnitude than one that might be developed in a larger school, nevertheless, the same historical mindedness, the same historical method, and the same historical judgments are employed. As the students interviewed alumni who had been peer-group leaders, and were now officials of the school and pillars of the community, these teenagers came to cope with some fairly sophisticated considerations:

. . . The students must deal with questions of social class, role, power, and status. Ultimately they deal with most of the important concepts found in the social sciences. History, because of its scope, utilizes a great deal of the conceptual base found in the social sciences. Thus, any oral history collection will deal with these same concepts and questions. More importantly these concepts will not be dealt with in an abstract sense, but rather will be handled as something real and concrete; something that affects the student directly.¹⁷

Newton concludes:

¹⁷Richard F. Newton, "Oral History: Using the School as an Historical Institution," *The Clearing House* 48 (October, 1973): 76-77.

Content is simply a vehicle. In this instance the oral history collection becomes a vehicle for the writing of history. It is through the compilation of the history of the school that the student is learning the methodology of history. The student can learn history just as well, if not better, through this process as if he were to go to the archives in Washington, D. C. It is not critical which history a student writes. It is more important that a student become involved in writing history. We should be concerned with the instructional efficiency of a given history. History teachers must give attention to this issue or watch the further demise of history in the schools.¹⁸

Obviously the advantage of this sort of project is that it involves the student personally and immediately in relevant activity. Motivation is high. It is easier for him to see that he must answer some big historical questions: What is gossip? What is illustrative? How do you compare and synthesize? What was the effect of world forces, such as depressions and wars? How can the data be organized in a readable form? Answering these questions is "doing history" at its very best.

Another equally appealing oral/visual history project, actually a series of projects, is a program developed by Mike

¹⁸Newton, p. 78.

Printz of the Topeka (Kansas) West High School Library staff. Now in its second year, this program has the advantage of being an on-going, scheduled course open to any qualified student. In the Topeka course, the student chooses some Kansas personality or event that lends itself to research and visual/oral presentation. The research uses both oral (individuals are contacted who were associated with the historical target) and written sources (the local library and archival repositories).

Initially, Mr. Printz conducts a structured orientation period employing a bibliography that includes: *The Foxfire Books* I, II, and III, Studs Terkel's books and recordings, and other examples of oral and visual bibliography such as Merle Miller's *Plain Speaking: An Oral Bibliography of Harry Truman*. Next the students are engaged in extensive background research using local historical records to be found in the Kansas State Historical Society, The Topeka *Capital-Journal* Library, the Shawnee County Register of Deeds, the local cemetery records, etc. Following the research, students tape interviews with people who were involved with the individual or in the event.

The students' final presentation may

include a synchronized slide/tape production, displays, and/or 8 mm. movies. An "Opening Night" is scheduled at the high school where presentations are made to the public. A few of the advertising "blurbs" for "Opening Night" give something of the flavor of the projects:

Amelia Earhart's Girlhood Friends . . . by students Jim Elkins and Brett Mosiman.

This project includes films showing the Earhart Museum in Atchison plus a rare first film visit to the home where she was born. Interviews are with Amelia's girlhood friends. A special film and tape interview with Muriel Earhart Morrissey (Amelia's sister) who lives in Boston adds authenticity to the many theories concerning her last flight and death.

Carry Nation and Ruth Stout . . . by student Tim Blackburn.

In 1900, Ruth Stout (now 94) marched with Carry Nation to destroy downtown Topeka's saloons. This oral history reconstructs that day plus the atmosphere and look of Topeka at the turn of the century. She is also a pioneer in hydroponic gardening and her brother, Rex Stout, was the famous mystery story writer.

The Bloody Benders . . . by students Steve Wareheim and Robert North.

In 1880, a German-born family of four arrived in Cherryvale and were the instigators of a bizarre series of robberies and murders. When a sheriff's posse arrived to investigate the mys-

terious disappearance of people, they found all the dead bodies in a grave underneath the orchard. The Benders mysteriously disappeared and were never heard from again. This oral history includes many of the theories concerning the fate of the Benders.

The projects have "caught fire" and expanded beyond Mr. Printz' original expectation. Not only have the projects received grants, including one from the American Association for State and Local History, but students have raised private funds to sponsor trips for interviews as far away as Texas and Boston and to display their vignettes at national meetings. Naturally the students are attracting considerable local attention, and their enthusiasm for history is running high.

The advantages of this project are many. First, as high school seniors, the students are doing serious history. Of the many articles written about their activities in the local school papers and elsewhere, the emphasis is on the interesting insights discovered. If Mr. Printz has any hidden "social science objectives" in the program he has had the good sense to keep them to himself. So far as the students are concerned, they see themselves as recreating the atmosphere of the past;

the observing public sees only that the presentations are interesting and informative.

No doubt there are many other academic fringe benefits, including clearer English composition, improved public presence in the student's presentations, heightened historical awareness, and better library research techniques, but the real purpose remains that of "doing history." Mr. Printz explains: "The project is intended to preserve some of the significant events in local history that might otherwise be lost, and kids today have lost contact with the older generation. Many don't have contact with their grandparents. We think the kids are missing out on something valuable."¹⁹ The project assumes that the "kids" are sophisticated enough to discover new historical insights and to pass their findings on to others in an interesting and stimulating manner.

There are other benefits accruing from Mr. Printz' approach. One of the most important is that of providing the students with an audience to see and to appreciate their works. Even the "Loneliness of the Long Distant Runner" has a

¹⁹Merle Bird, "Pupils' Aim: Historical Vignettes," *The Topeka State Journal* (January 22, 1976): 1.

track meet to show off the results of his isolated discipline. An audience, especially one composed of, supported by, and appealing to the historian's peers, does much to revive interest in history as a living and exciting endeavor. Certainly, history can't be dull if Carry Nation, The Bloody Benders, and Amelia Earhart are the exhibits on display. Then too, the fact that this program comes from the library must be recorded with enthusiasm. Moving that area from storage and retrieval to creativity and display of newly invented historical pieces needs our inordinate praise.

And finally, not only is the project multi-media but it takes the student through some of the rigors of preparation and research necessary to historical inquiry. Unmonitored oral history can be no more than meandering gossip and a record of faulty memories. On the other hand, when supported by systematic research, it can give life to the bare bones of historical fact. As other advocates have warned, oral history techniques are not a substitute for all other historical techniques. "Oral history [is only] another tool in the repertoire of the social studies arsenal. It is not a panacea to all ills. How-

ever, it provides another dimension to the classroom, allowing students to immerse themselves in their subject and allowing the subject to be transposed from thought to process."²⁰

These sorts of projects obviously work as well at the college level as at the secondary. Among the most popular college history courses at my own institution has been one in which the "doing" component was directed toward the student tracing the history of his home town, church, local business, or family migration. The most successful term papers in that stage of my own historical itinerary were those in which the assignment read: "Trace the cause and consequence of some historical happening which occurred on the day you were born." Personal motivation and access to a quantity of material were prime ingredients in "turning the student on."

The college-age history student requires more than motivation, however, and his goals should be more sophisticated and his training more precise. There is the further complicating practical prob-

²⁰Murry R. Nelson and H. Wells Singleton, "Using Oral History in the Social Studies Classroom," *The Clearing House* 49 (October, 1975): 93.

lem of sheer numbers. The intellectual distance between the teacher-specialist and his student audience and the open ended policies governing almost every aspect of the students' intellectual lives, also create an atmosphere in which the maturing student is placed on his own both socially and academically to test his intellectual talents. Furthermore, the mature student must come to master the major tool of the trade, i.e., the library.

The library can be a formidable obstacle in spite of its surface respectability. The word "library" may conjure up visions of students pouring over books in a hushed, but tensely exciting, aura of learning where the wisdom of the ages fairly leaps out of the cloistered stacks. Libraries are eulogized as "the heart of the campus," "the center of learning," "temples of freedom," and "treasuries of knowledge." But there is the other side of the coin.

Finley Peter Dunne, as far back as the last century, had a different idea, as he explained in his dissertation on Carnegie Libraries:

A Carnaygie libry is a large, brown-stone, impenethrible buildin' with th' name iv th' maker blown on th' dure. Libry, fr'm th' Greek wur-

ruds, libus, a book, an' ary, sildom, —sildom a book. Carnaygie libry is archytechoor, not lith-rachoor.

Isn't it good f'r lithrachoor, says ye? Sure, I think not, Hinnisy. Libries niver encouraged lithrachoor anny more thin tombstones encourage livin'. No wan iver wrote annythin' because he was tol' that a hundred years from' now his books might be taken down fr'm a shelf in a granite sepulcher an' some wan wud write 'Good' or 'This man is crazy' in th' margin. What lithrachoor needs is fillin' food. If Andhrew wud put a kitchen in th' libries and' build some bunks or even swing a few hammocks where livin' authors cud crawl in at night an' sleep while waitin' f'r this enlightened nation to wake up an' discover th' Shakespeares now on th' turf, he wud be givin' a rare boost to lithrachoor. With th' smoke curlin' fr'm th' chimbley, an' hundherds iv potes settin' around' a table loaded down with pancakes an' talkin' pothry an' prize-fightin', with hundherds iv other potes, stacked up natly in th' sleepin' rooms an' snorin' in wan gran' chorus, with their wives holdin' down good-payin' jobs as libraryans or cooks, an' their happy little childher playin' through th' marble corrydors, Andhrew Carnagie wud not have lived in vain.²¹

Unfortunately, despair of libraries as "impenethrible" buildings has not altogether left the contemporary college cam-

²¹ Finley Peter Dunne, *Dissertations by Mr. Dooley* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1906), p. 82.

pus. To demonstrate the fallacy of the concept of the library being "the heart of the campus," stop by your own local college library and calculate what percentage of the students is present; then go to the stacks and note how often your favorite "must" history tome has been checked out. Finally, compare the circulation statistics with the total number of students on campus.

What is true about libraries is also true about books. Books too are extolled as Sacred Vessels of Truth, Wonderous Bright Candles in a Night of Ignorance, etc. Like libraries, books are to many academicians firstly, emotional symbols and only secondly, intellectual tools. If you doubt the validity of this statement, try to weed an outdated collection and feel the vibrations of violence emanating from the faculty offices.

Without emotional overlay, a library can be described rationally as a miscellaneous collection of materials housed in a building of X number of square feet; costing no more than ninety cents per annum to maintain each of those square feet; filled with books espousing as much ignorance as truth, as much emotionalism as rational thought, as much dogmatism

as wisdom, and as much outdated and incorrect data as relevant findings; organized so that only 5 percent of the books are checked out at any one time; and where only 60 percent of the requests for materials in the collection can be filled because these materials are in some disabling process or are already checked out. If not "impenethrable," the library is at best a tool that is not always easy to master and that may not automatically solve the researcher's problems.

Like a book, the library is useful if accessible and applicable. It is the use that counts. Remember it was one of America's finest producers of books, Mark Twain, who said: "I like a thin book because it will steady a table, a leather volume because it will strap a razor, and a heavy book because it can be thrown at a cat." If the library is to be more than a thin support for lectures or a heavy assignment to throw at the student, it must be carefully employed as a hone to skillfully sharpen the students' wits and abilities.

It is at this point that the Library-College concept has most to offer, for it advocates a useful alliance among teachers, librarians, and students so that they

all share the great potential of both the classroom and the library.

At the collegiate level the major objective of the structured class instruction is to charm the student into dealing with, and gaining an understanding of, the historical process, i.e., to appreciate the problems inherent in and the value of reconstructing the past. The student needs to consider conflicting testimony, to realize the limitations of incomplete data, to be aware of biased contemporary accounts and prejudiced judgments, to be wary of repeated assumptions, and, in the end, to be able to present an objective narrative that attempts to state the true case. The critical functions of the teacher-historian are: preparing the student to meet the historical task (conceivably this preparation could even involve a lecture), assisting the student in finding intriguing topics, and directing the student to appropriate sources. Of these three fundamentals of supervised learning, the librarian can assist students in doing two, or even three, as an ally and, happily, an unpaid associate.

The partnership requires the historian to accept the librarian as a great deal more

than a technician who can retrieve on command (Fetch, Booser! Good Old Boy!) material (sticks or bones; stats or tomes) from the stacks. When the librarian is brought into the project early as an associate in learning, then the complicated process can bring the student to appreciate and master the essential skills and to share the excitement of "finding his way in the library," to use Patricia Knapp's expression.²²

Once the librarian understands he

²²Mrs. Knapp explains that "The term 'way' in the sense of 'method' implies knowledge and understanding of the interlocking organization of the library and scholarly communication. Whoever would use the system must know the 'way' to use the system. Knowing the way means understanding the nature of the total system, knowing where to plug into it, knowing how to make it work. . . . It means, on the one hand, understanding that the nature and degree of bibliographic control characteristic of any discipline is likely to depend on the maturity of the discipline, the extent to which its work is cumulative, the economic support society is willing to give it, and the social structure in which its practitioners work. It means appreciating, on the other hand, that there are communication needs and purposes common to all disciplines. It means knowing and being able to use the tools of scholarly communication, the tools of library organization, and the tools which connect the two." Patricia Bryan Knapp, *The Monteith College Library Experiment* (New York: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1966), pp. 82-83.

is not just a retriever, he can do much to develop students' insights into the problems of verification and to improve the student's analytical powers while at the same time he is developing technical library research skills. Both student and librarian work under ideal conditions of openness because they are not institutionally programmed into a master-trainee relationship which leads to critical evaluation. The student can ask the "dumb question" without fear of authority censure, or judgment from the librarian. Unfortunately, the instructor is always part judge, handing down "A" and "F" sentences. The librarian is more of a partner to the student in a treasure hunt who just happens to know more about spades, pick axes, and treasure maps than the student. His is an enviable instructional position.

Furthermore, the librarian can do certain things for the student in understanding history that the historian rarely does. He, almost instinctively, checks the tendency of the historian to over-specialize. He sees, or should see, more than "pure" history which is the normal perspective of the disciplinarian. In the words of Louis Shores:

The librarian, as a natural generalist is best equipped, of all faculty, to accomplish this. Through his professional concern with epistemology, with the classification of knowledge, with the provision for a generalia class; with his traditional impartiality toward all of the disciplines, he can be trusted, more than his colleague specialists, to represent the universes in perspectives. In addition, through his own learning device of browsing, he can encourage a cross-subject approach to an understanding of the riddles of the universe. He can, indeed, introduce into the bloodstream of the learning life that phenomenon which science has but recently discovered, namely, serendipity.²³

The addition of the librarian to the teaching team can prove to be one of the best moves that educators in a school or college ever make.

As we have held up certain specific models for "doing history" on the secondary level, let me suggest at least one for a college assignment as well. As in other instances, this will be an actual course, one which I helped direct along with Sandra Sheppard, formerly a librarian at Milikin University, and now a member of the faculty, Assumption Public Schools, Assumption, Illinois. The experiment came

²³Louis Siores, "The Junior College Impact on Academic Librarianship," *College and Research Libraries* 30 (May, 1969): 214-221.

into being only after considerable groping, but, fortunately, it also developed a considerable amount of Mr. Shores' serendipity, and represents the last stop in my personal search for an acceptable instructional method.

To begin with I should point out that I was trapped into doing it. As Dean I had promised a Black History course to a group of students, and had, in fact, already appointed a black instructor. Then, just before the summer term began, he cancelled his contract, and I was left with my commitment for the fall.

Luckily, I had enrolled in a workshop on the "Materials of Negro Culture" which the Foundation for the Arts and Humanities was presenting that summer at Duke University. By attending I was able to learn more about the bibliography of Black history, as well as some of the historical data, and at the same time hear about a few of the pitfalls that come with teaching this subject. Above all, I gained enough assurance to admit to the assembled students on the first day of class that while I possessed great curiosity, and even some bibliographic competence, in the subject we were about to study I had only a limited knowledge of Black

History as a discipline. Clearly, we were not going to "survey" or "cover" the black experience in America.

Once past this hurdle, the entire class divided itself into groups of two or three students who then selected topics for a study that were approved by me, the "convener of the class." Mrs. Sheppard, the librarian mentioned above, sat in on these sessions, and since she had both an interest in, and facility with, the literature of this subject the students soon came to see her as an ally in developing the history they were to write. She was what the Library-College calls a "disciplinary-oriented librarian."

An important ingredient in this model was the student's oral presentation to the class. This, together with a more formal paper that Mrs. Sheppard and I examined from the standpoint of both content and use of materials, provided an outlet for each student to demonstrate what he had achieved. It proved to be an important consideration. After all, half the fun of making mud pies is in showing them off. In this case the "audience" was of two types, judges and peers. The student's own peers became fine, critical reviewers who

were not reticent to challenge assumptions, sources, and conclusions.

Since the students were primarily interested in the sociology of the black experience, the historical structure prompted them to develop their topics in an orderly chronology. And while it is true that much pseudo-historical material came into their hands, and there was a significant amount of atypical bibliographical material used in their presentations, it is equally true that few inferior sources or dubious content passed without scrupulous questioning by the student audience. Moreover, the librarian was soon recognized as a person who could assemble factual support for a disputable issue. As a result, she not only got caught up in the various topics, but also acted as a spur to bibliographic mastery.

As a model, this approach has much to offer. What the student learned, he mastered on his own. Furthermore, it enabled the librarian to become a respected and active partner to both the instructor and the student. Equally important, much significant historical content was acquired, but more to the point the research process developed positive student commitment.

If attitude exposure, or even attitudinal changes, had been the goal, the course could be counted a success.

Beyond all these points were many personal and disciplinary acquisitions as well. A list of the more obvious would include: the realization that historical events do not develop in isolation; that problems overlap and stem from several causes; that history is an "argument"—and sometimes an emotional one; that libraries represent a range of tools which a person must learn to use; and that historical sources are not just citations which professors mention in class lectures or hand out in a dittoed bibliography, but are references which can turn up anywhere and throw light on any question.

As a byproduct, a cross-section of black and white Americans came to discuss openly, and frequently—though not always rationally—certain serious questions weighing heavily on the American social consciousness. To a considerable extent "The Growth of Self-Awareness" was realized as an extra, unexpected bit of serendipity.

As an approach to "doing history," the teaching team which includes the librarian and historian may not insure learn-

ing by all students; it may not even make all libraries the receptacle of "lithrachoor" and not crass "archytechoor"; and it may not even make all historians teachers rather than recounters; nor all librarians educators rather than retrievers. However, the team approach does present another, viable option for the history instructor who certainly needs all the assistance he can muster.

Let me conclude by citing the example of an earlier, effective master of library technique:

Frank Heywood Hodder, legendary teacher of history at the University of Kansas, met his students in an alcove off the main reading room of the library. There, surrounded by the relevant books on the subject, he would flip through his class cards calling on students for answers, and if they were stumped, they could turn to the sources at hand. This probably came as near to Mark Hopkins on a log as historians ever get. With classes of thirty or forty this technique would be difficult and highly impractical if more than one professor attempted it. Barring a breakthrough to make such an approach possible, the librarian today can be of great help in giving direction to a systematic and orderly collection of various tools—film, strips, tapes, cassettes, i.e., the Generic Book—and teaching students as they come to the collection to work through a historical problem. The teacher-his-

torian undoubtedly can give meaning to approaching history from a standpoint of attitudinal objectives; the librarian can be invaluable as the student begins "doing" history. As he handles the material, the librarian becomes essential. The historian creates the climate; the librarian molds the craftsmen. It can be a healthy partnership.²⁴

²⁴C. Robert Haywood, "The Teacher and the Library-Teacher," *Liberal Education* 55 (May, 1969): 295.

Editor's Note—While the views that are expressed in the first section of this book have numerous implications, nowhere do they seem to have more pertinence than in the following discussion between Patricia Knapp and Robert Haywood. The transcript which appears here is an edited version of the remarks that these two educators made at a meeting of the Library-College in July, 1968, at the Muehlbach Hotel, Kansas City, Missouri. It was an eventful session, and while all comments for the evening were transcribed on a tape recorder, none of this material has ever before appeared in print. Since the entire exchange dealt with the idea of facilitating self-directed growth within the educational system, it is fitting that this discussion should comprise the final section of *The Doing of History*.

IV

Putting the Library-College to Work: A Discussion

Haywood: I am at heart a teacher. I confess this in order to establish my credentials, for I would like to deal here with the teaching of history and how the Library-College might serve as a method for carrying out this function. For over ten years I labored exclusively in Cleo's vineyard as an honest, hard-working, full-time teacher-historian. Although in recent years, as an administrator, I have had a difficult time convincing my faculty that I deserve any of those adjectives, I have been fortunate in being able to teach at least one course every semester, and as a result of this experience I have come

to appreciate the Library-College as it relates to the study of my discipline. It, of course, could have equal pertinence to the study of other subjects, but since I am most comfortable in relating it to what I know best, I would like to start this discussion by pointing out a few of the reasons for my interest.

Obviously, history teachers and librarians who are interested in the Library-College have much in common, and equally obvious, an historian speaking to a group of librarians who are knowledgeable about the Library-College feels perfectly at ease because of the long years of contact with the breed. Both understand the importance which the bibliographic apparatus has to the mastery of content, and both the historian and the librarian—or media specialist, if you will—know the importance of working together. The problems arise, I think, when I begin to discuss the teacher-historian. The partnership that exists between the historian and the librarian has in the past broken down when the historian-teacher has too timidly dealt with the tools of the library in teaching the discipline. In these cases there has regularly been a fail-

ure to transfer the necessary partnership to the classroom.

On this last point I can speak from experience.

For several years I taught classes in history with hardly any reference whatever to the library as a range of tools. Consequently, some of the things that I'll say here will probably sound like the town's drunk at a revival meeting because for years as far as I was concerned we, my students, that is, abandoned the library. It didn't appear to have that much use to them or to me as a teacher of undergraduate students and so I simply didn't urge them to darken the doors.

I followed the tides and fads of the time. There were term paper assignments with less than spectacular results. Marshalling research for a short, and I fear not very exciting, discourse from my classroom lectures undoubtedly resulted in one of the most wasted week-ends in college, mainly because most of the students tended to put off this task until the last minute. Then on the week-end before the paper was due (Was that 1000 or 10,000 words, Prof. Haywood?) the student would scramble together a miscellaneous collection of

facts, half-truths, and muddy conclusions drawn from two or three secondary sources and the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Insofar as the teaching-learning process was concerned, my students were actually abusing rather than using the library. I tried other "innovative" approaches by using all the popular teaching aids that successively came into vogue—paperbacks, source books, and articles from magazines—but the results were always the same. The students had no motivation to handle the raw materials of the subject. As a consequence they never *experienced* the meaning of history.

There was also the tendency to rely heavily upon my own lectures. If I told the student what *my* research had discovered about history, obviously they would have the best that the best of research could give them. The pearls were being cast, it was up to the student to root them out. Besides there were all those human interest stories and dramatic historical allusions to stir the student on to seek his own history.

The trouble, of course, was that they didn't. The student was simply not engaged. They did not come to grips with history on their own. I, or the author of

the textbook or sourcebook, was doing all the work—we were “doing” the history. The student was not. It was I who was doing all the studying, for obviously I could not discuss in my lecture what I had not first learned on my own. Furthermore, it was I who was selecting what they read, and it was I who decided what they must remember by indicating what parts of these readings would be on the tests which I alone contrived. I was getting a great deal of satisfaction out of our teacher-student relationship. It was obvious that I was learning more history than the student who was paying good tuition money to do so.

In saying all this I do not want to leave the impression that such tools as paperbacks, lectures, and source books are never useful. On the contrary, these tools—like other media—have much to offer. Their weakness is simply that most teachers utilize them in purely prescriptive ways. By their very nature these tools tend to do the work for the student. Even the sourcebooks tend to ruin the mystery, i.e., the possibility of intellectual discovery, by telling the whole story in the first few pages. The lecture is equally notorious for capsulizing history, especially when a

teacher uses it for the purpose of having students learn "the answer." As a technique it is designed for just that; it does provide *the* answer! Moreover, if the teacher who uses this method is an exceptionally good lecturer it provides *the absolute* answer. And when the lecture is supported by a textbook, the student is given not only *the absolute* answer but *the complete and absolute* answer. Any good textbook, one you would ask the student to pay for, will automatically advertise that it "covers the subject thoroughly."

But back to my own conversion. I eventually resolved to find a way which would enable my students to "do" history, to let them handle it, feel it, and experience it. Not surprisingly, this brought me back in contact with the library. Not as historian, but as a teacher-historian. And this in turn brought me up against another problem.

I probably should have anticipated this next difficulty, for it has long been a common one in the small college, the type of institution where I have spent most of my career. In essence the problem lies in the fact that the history collections of the typical small college library

tend to be something like rings which appear in the trunks of trees. In most small college libraries you can trace the history of the history department by examining its book collection just as you can see the development of a tree by looking at its rings.

Essentially, it works like this.

For five years Professor X is on the faculty, and since he is a Civil War specialist the library purchases heavily in Civil War materials. Upon his departure Professor Y—whose interest is Colonial history—comes in, and as a result there is unusual growth in this subject. Then when Y leaves, and another specialist arrives, yet another ring of materials appears. And so it goes *ad infinitum*, with the pattern rarely varying. By examining the stacks, or the acquisitions record, one can tell who taught what and when he taught it.

Since I once discussed this more fully in an early issue of *The Library-College Journal*,¹ I will only restate it here briefly in order to make the point that if there is to be any "doing" of history each student must be able to lay hands on enough

¹C. Robert Haywood, "Old, Bold Librarians," *Library-College Journal* 1 (Summer, 1968): 11-14.

material to give his study relevance and reliability. For the small school it is impossible to count on a department to display such evenhandedness unless there is long-range planning that everyone adheres to for the sake of continuity.

It goes without saying that in the large university this problem is of negligible importance. If, for example, Professor X in Greek history leaves and Professor Y in Greek history comes, the latter will continue to recommend approximately the same types of materials, which means the library will maintain considerable continuity in its collection. In the small college, however, where three- to six-man departments are common, the loss of only one member can mean as much as a 50 percent change in the pattern of ordering. As a consequence, the librarian must join with the department in making a determination as to what direction the collection will grow for the next several years.

In implementing such a policy the library and department members must have the freedom to act courageously. The librarian must be closely involved with the history department or the sociology

department in jointly determining what is to be emphasized. They must say: "All right, they have decided to be strong in Colonial history and the Franklin D. Roosevelt period. We will purchase heavily in those areas." When Professor X leaves and Professor Y replaces him, the librarian should be able to remind him of the ten-year plan. The purchases should continue in depth in those areas previously determined. It is only by following such a scheme that each instructor is assured that when his students need to handle history they will be able to do so. Moreover, the implementation of this idea should enable both the librarian and the teacher to collaborate in working with individual students.

Needless to say, getting educational bureaucracies to accept a plan such as this is difficult to do. Fortunately, however, implementation of the Library-College is not contingent upon this, or any other one, single idea. Therefore, even if ideal conditions never prevail in a particular school, the history teacher and librarian can still utilize this method in ways that allow the students to handle the materials of the discipline. Obviously,

the better the collection the more students can work individually or in groups on intrinsically interesting problems.

My interest in the Library-College, then, stems from both practical—even administrative—reasons, as well as theoretical considerations. On the one hand I see the potential in it for the student to have access to the best materials available. At the same time it provides for a "doing" of history in the best theoretical sense of the term. In promoting this, my first concern is not so much that students learn to find their way around the library, but that in doing so they come to appreciate and understand history through the process of "doing" it.

When a student undertakes this "doing" in a systematic, but personal, manner he automatically has the opportunity to think, evaluate, and decide. Moreover, he soon is aware that these actions can have a reciprocal effect. Even more important, the student is challenged to utilize sources, handle bibliographies, and sort out particulars. As he does so he discovers what it means to see novel relationships, reconcile conflicting authorities, and formulate hypotheses. In short, he experiences learning.

Knapp: Dr. Haywood, new ideas always interest me. I was thinking, however, as I felt some skepticism about your proposal, that pragmatically your plan for making the teaching faculty adhere to a long-range acquisitions policy will be difficult to sell. Few people in education could put it over, and history teachers who suggest such things usually turn out to be Deans, principals, or some other kind of administrator. Then students no longer have them as history teachers.

In saying this I should point out that ideas of this kind are not entirely new to me. I was reminded of a meeting I once attended in which Louis Gottschalk proposed, in a kind of deadpan seriousness, that when a teacher leaves one school and moves to another the library collection ought to go with him. This may be much more sensible than it first appears, but sensible or not ideas such as these rarely, if ever, gain acceptance.

But whatever the merits of your acquisitions plan, the ideas you outlined about transforming the teaching of history into the "doing" of this subject deserve every consideration. I, for one, am tremendously interested in your approach. In fact, teachers of history at all levels

of the system should be thinking along these lines. It is happening at some places and with some professors. I fear that librarians are not as aware of this fact as they ought to be.

In this connection I once had an experience which I would like to recount. This experience took place at Wayne State University when I became involved in a fellowship program for school librarians who had only a modest background in liberal studies. As part of this program we brought in guest lecturers from Wayne State's Monteith College who could speak on the importance of the humanities. In arranging these speakers, we asked each one to tell our school librarians about the nature and structure of his discipline.

The first guest we had in this series was an historian, and he spoke to the same point you have just made. In making his remarks, however, he overstated his case, for among other things this not-so-gentle professor said, "History is not something that is finished and put on the shelf. You librarians think that the history of the French Revolution is Dewey Decimal number 944, and that once put on the shelf with this classification that is all there is to it." He then went on to empha-

size history's multicausal nature and the fact that it is rewritten by each generation. My job at the next session of that fellowship program was to convey how this related to the library.

To me the one thing that came through more than any other from this experience was that although the librarian's view of history may be anachronistic, the history professor's view of librarianship is equally outdated. I believe, for instance, that he was entirely wrong in thinking that librarians perceive the French Revolution in terms of nothing but 944. (I'm talking in Dewey here, not dates!).

When, for example, we asked him, "How would you like students to use the library?" he didn't have much of an answer. In fact, his reply was singularly lame, for he said merely, "I want them to use all the library, not just the 900's—not just the history collection, but the whole library." Librarians do too. Furthermore, most of them know it is no accident when a student *does* use the entire collection.

Here is another anecdote in connection with this kind of thing. Just a few months ago I had a student in one of my classes who was the wife of a history

teacher. As part of this course each student was to complete a special project, and since the teacher's wife wanted to do something practical she designed an assignment for her husband's class in American history. As a preliminary to the assignment she devised a survey quiz on library tools which she had her husband give to the 135 students in the class. Upon analyzing the results both the teacher and his wife were amazed at how little the students knew.

Since the returns from this little exercise indicated that some remedial action was in order, she then designed a short assignment which amounted to updating the bibliographies that appear in the entries of 135 Reconstruction figures listed in the *Dictionary of American Biography*. Needless to say, this task brought each student into contact with a whole chain of sources, including historical journals, abstracts, calendars, and indexes, and because of this all could see that history is more than a mere set of facts that someone puts in a book and entombs on the shelf. To most of these undergraduates it was a revelation.

But as revealing as this was to the history students, another finding which

came out of this assignment was even more of a shock to the teacher's wife. Actually, this discovery appeared fairly early in the planning stages of this assignment, for in studying the bibliographies that appear in the D.A.B. she made the overwhelming discovery that this well-known, multi-volume dictionary was out of date. It was a genuine shock, mainly because her own teachers had uniformly stressed the idea that the D.A.B. was an irrefutable classic of great scholarly worth. Yet there it was. She had discovered it for herself. The D.A.B. was out of date.

Now, when it comes to collaboration a librarian can't beat the advantages that come with having a husband as the history teacher! Which leads me to the matter of relationships between the library staff and faculty. I am convinced that librarians and teachers should develop more skill in listening to each other. When teachers say "to do history" librarians really ought to understand that as meaning something different from studying history in the traditional sense. Similarly, when librarians speak of classifying French Revolution materials in the 944's, they are not claiming that nothing else in the collection bears on this subject. We haven't

learned to listen as much as we should.

There is an axiom that librarians deal with each patron on an individual level. Whether this idea is valid or not, it is too often forgotten that communication between librarians, teachers, and students infers that each of these groups should listen to the other. When this is done learning can take place more efficiently. And when this kind of communication becomes a regular occurrence between librarians and teachers the result is a collaboration which can greatly facilitate the student's study of all possible materials.

During the early 1950's I did some field work at Knox College which led to an interesting experience in this connection, for as part of my investigation the librarian there collaborated with the history professor in producing a forged historical document which each student compared to one they found in the library. The students were to determine which of the documents in the collection were authentic and which were false. It was an assignment that involved both thinking and discovery, and it definitely called for a good deal of interdisciplinary communication. Educators need to think in these terms much more than they do.

Another experience of a similar kind happened to me while evaluating an interdisciplinary program that I had helped plan and execute. As part of this evaluation we drafted a letter to the students who had been in the program, and who were now school librarians with at least one year of experience. In a nutshell this letter took the form of an S.O.S. which said, "Please describe in three pages or less what impact, if any, your interdisciplinary studies have had on your work as a librarian during the past year."

Almost everyone reported instances in which he or she was better able to work with teachers as a result of having done some interdisciplinary thinking. One, for example, reported the establishment of regular meetings with two or three third grade teachers in which everyone jointly planned some truly experimental projects. Another ex-student was asked to be a spokesman for a curriculum committee. When put in sociological jargon, this meant that these librarians were beginning to act as "change agents" in their schools.

At this point I began to do some reading on educational innovations. In doing so I noticed that most writers who discussed this subject seemed to think the

principal was in a better position than anyone else to create change in a school environment, mainly because he is uniquely situated to see the whole picture. Even so, most authors found the typical principal invariably dedicated to maintaining the status quo. If this is valid, then surely the librarian should move to fill this vacuum. He is, after all, in the next best position to see the total picture, and probably in the best position for being a positive influence. The librarian poses little, if any, threat to his colleagues, and typically plays a role that teachers as well as students perceive as being helpful. As a result, the librarian should generate a minimum of fear among colleagues, a factor which is crucial in educational dealings, for teachers are always chary of anyone they fear, particularly in the administration.

Admittedly, this doesn't mean that librarians can simply approach various faculty members and say, "Look, I'm going to be your change agent." They can, however, use their peculiarly advantageous position to make decisive moves when the time for change is ripe. This too is important, for if librarians use this

advantage wisely they can motivate all teachers to introduce those changes which can transform most instruction from a spewing out of facts to a challenge to develop.

And this leads me to the final point I'd like to make.

I believe that librarians at all levels of the educational system feel they really haven't anything to offer unless their subject credentials are equal to those of teachers. Librarians *can't* possibly have as much subject matter competence as teachers! Nor should librarians as a class delude themselves into thinking that they will get acceptance by teachers on the basis of some subject specialization. This being the case, librarians should concentrate on exploiting the competence they do have, which is knowing about the relationship between materials and learning.

Putting this competence to work in the educational system is of the utmost importance. In fact, nothing is any more important, for learning correlates to a large extent with the skill a person has in utilizing this connection. Moreover, since many teachers don't even know this relationship exists it is clear that librar-

ians have both an opportunity and a responsibility before them. Some would even say it represents a challenge.

While librarians across the board have so far shied away from facing such a challenge, they may soon be inheriting the task through default. This is because most teachers seem to have no interest in the job. When, for example, you ask most faculty what they teach, or what their course consists of, they will tell you what they cover, i.e., the content. They say little or nothing about the relationship between materials, or the value of those experiences which come from using media. Least of all do they say anything about the skillbuilding which results from having these experiences. And they say little about such matters for quite a good reason. Few have any knowledge of what these things involve.

Dr. Haywood, would you like to respond to my rambling remarks?

Haywood: Generally speaking, your observations about the historian who also teaches are true. In the past he has thought of his subject as being something he "covers." And as an historian offering a course in U.S. History from 1865 to 1875, he feels

he must "cover" all facets of the Reconstruction period. Still, I think there is a growing awareness that there is not, and never again will be, a definable coverage for any era.

In saying this I recognize that many institutions of higher learning prominently display statements in their catalogues indicating that when a student graduates he will have both a knowledge of and an appreciation for our Western heritage. Furthermore, they make this claim even though it rests on the tenuous assumption that existing somewhere in the world is a fund of knowledge which educated people clearly ought to have. There was a time when this viewpoint was supreme. Indeed, among academicians it was Holy Writ. The student could count himself liberally educated only if he could repeat certain particulars about Barbaroso and Alexander Hamilton. We've now gone beyond that, I hope. And while some historians may regret this development, few are in agreement on what could now make up a minimum fund of knowledge, much less how a teacher might or ought to "cover" it.

History teachers, then, are starting to see that although historical events are dis-

crete there is also a continuity to them. This is basic, for the moment an instructor comes to such an understanding he can discard the notion that history is a neat package of facts, divisible into tidy little compartments, or eras, and each bearing a distinctive-sounding label. And once this idea is discarded the teacher starts to realize it doesn't make much difference which period of history he teaches.

In light of all this it is my prediction that the old Western Civilization courses will soon be going by the board. The same is true of the survey American history sequences. In their place will appear units covering shorter periods of time which the teacher will use for "in depth" studies, to use a favorite term. As this happens the purpose of teaching history will shift from covering the facts to developing attitudes, devising techniques, and finding new approaches.

Many scholars decry this. Not long ago, for example, I read an article characterizing this approach as "the post-hole technique of history," in which the student digs down in one little spot, then moves and digs in another limited area. The result, it is feared, is that the student knows more and more about less and less.

In short, he has nothing to show for his effort but a series of informational units which have little connection. The alternative, it might be suggested, is to continue the surveys with even greater sweep and ever more shallow presentation.

Many history teachers are simply at a loss as to how they should approach their own subject. There is too much of it. Furthermore, it increases in size with each passing day, all of which means that many teachers are being overwhelmed by its magnitude. And this is not only true of history, of course, but of the social sciences in general. Realization of this might well turn teachers back to the library for assistance in helping the student discover the variety of sources beyond 944. Once this becomes more common, methods that center on use of materials rather than exactitude of coverage will be a necessity.

Knapp: There is no question in my mind but what this is the trend of the future. Nor do I doubt that with the advent of this trend educators will give up on the idea of total coverage. Succeeding with an alternative that involves the Generic Book, however, means that librarians

will have to join in the work of enabling each student to exploit the Communication Way. For more ideas on this, or for any other thoughts that relate to the Library-College, may we have some comments and questions from those in the audience.

Question: Dr. Haywood, would you be willing to abandon your students to the library so they could use materials freely, i.e., without any instruction, lectures, or advice from you?

Haywood: I would not, and if I read correctly the literature of the Library-College this concept does not propose that any educator "abandon," or "turn loose," students in the library. Indeed, the Library-College, it seems to me, envisions just the opposite, for with this method the teacher—a term which includes the librarian—is just as much a learner as are any of the students. In addition, I would like to stress that both the teacher and his lecture are components, just as periodicals are, or audiovisual materials, or calculators, of what the Library-College calls the Generic Book. As yet I have discerned no one instrument or technique that will meet the demands of contemporary scholarship for

students at every level. For this reason alone it should be clear that I have nothing against the lecture as such; indeed, many students seem to feel comfortable with it. The problem lies in the fact that too many teachers misuse this type of one-way presentation to limit what a student is exposed to.

The trap we get ourselves into is the tendency to see the issue as EITHER the lecture OR something innovative, such as abandoning students to the library. Last year, for example, a history teacher with whom I am acquainted carried out an experiment in which he lectured to one section of a Western Civilization class and "abandoned" the other section to the library. The units he chose to test covered a six weeks period, and while no one pretends that the findings which came out of this experiment are definitive, or that educators can extrapolate them to a larger area, they are at least interesting to think about in the context of the merits of the Library-College and the lecture.

In brief, these findings indicated that while some students in both the structured and unstructured situations received better grades and some poorer marks, most students in both groups scored about the

same on factual matters presented on tests. Presumably, this means that insofar as retaining discrete pieces of information was concerned it made little difference whether that particular instructor lectured or abandoned his students to the library.

The students, however, indicated through an evaluation of this experience that they liked the lecture and missed it when it was gone. In particular, they seemed to miss the contribution of the professor—his ability to stimulate interest, his insights into how to organize and synthesize, and his allusions to causal relationships—all those good things which lecturers have perennially claimed they are so apt at doing. These particular students missed very much the lecture when it was gone.

Personally, I would not like to see an end to class sessions, even when they offer nothing but straight, stand-up lectures. If nothing else they enable students to come together and form a "we" feeling. This is not inconsequential, for it means that an identifiable number of people are at least focusing most of their attention at a given time on a question of mutual concern in an organized way. Furthermore, students need to be able to reveal

to one another what they have discovered. They need the "show and tell" stimulation.

In my own work, I have at various times structured classes so that this identity can come into play in a number of ways. For instance, I have divided a class into small groups for purposes of discussing paperbacks which the students have purchased and, it is hoped, read. The individual student has then been assigned to a different group with a different topic for a term paper. The idea is to allow students to share new information as well as share common understandings, a kind of vertical-horizontal interaction. Since the emphasis is on skill in use of tools as well as analysis of content, all students share a wider range of views from a larger number of sources. The result is a blending of personalized thinking and new information.

So my direct answer to your question would have to be, I feel it is neither wise nor beneficial to "abandon" students to the library, and it is certainly not in keeping with the Library-College concept. Learning requires discipline and thought, and when done in group environments this usually means it is best to have a facilitator of learning available who can

minimize the lost motion that comes with trial and error searching. Because subject matter specialists can do only so much in this regard, we need librarians to work in partnership with instructors so students can learn to be learners through responsible self-direction.

Question: It seems to me that many people are setting up a straw man by disparaging the lecture method. By this I mean that there are lecturers who are especially effective with students, I think Dr. Haywood made this point when he said that there should be types of classroom situations that are appropriate for each student. To this I might add, there are no classroom situations that are appropriate for some students.

Incidentally, I would like to mention a book that was published some time ago on this subject. It was written by Joseph Katz and Associates, and is entitled *No Time For Youth*. This work is a study of students at Stanford and Berkeley, and makes a strong case for different methods for different students.

In summary, then, I hope we won't go overboard in saying that the lecture is through. The lecture is not through,

there are many students who profit from it. I know one professor, for example, who does not require the use of any library, but he motivates students to read. Furthermore, he gets them to read because he fires them up in a lecture, all of which leads me to believe that the lecture, like the discussion method—or any other approach you want to mention—is still usable.

Haywood: I would agree. I hope there is no misunderstanding on this. So far as I know the literature of the Library-College does not advocate the scrapping of the lecture; it is one more tool which human beings can use when wanting to learn. It is, however, only *one* tool, and since—as you pointed out—students are different, educators need to temper its use with those tools that more nearly meet these differences. Because the exponents of the Library-College continue to make an issue of this point I probably need to re-emphasize it.

On the other hand, Norman Grabner at the University of Illinois had classes of 500 students. They were obviously lecture classes. It would have been a shame to have broken them down into small dis-

cussion sections in order that ten students could pick Grabner's brain rather than have 500 hear and benefit. Also, it is axiomatic, if not trite, to say that a good lecture is preferred to a mediocre discussion or ill-directed independent research project. In Grabner's case, one benefit for the student was that all could see how he marshalled his data and arrived at his conclusions, that is, how his mind worked. So, I would agree that no one technique is the total answer. It must also be said—and I believe here is the problem—that too many teachers have an exaggerated notion of how insightful their lectures are, and how many insights they generate among students. In addition, I would like to point out that most historians already know how to do the lecture. Why not try something else? Any ideas on that, Mrs. Knapp?

Knapp: I would like to add only that if different approaches work for different students, that is one thing. But what too frequently happens is that we merely use different techniques for different topics or for teaching different courses, which doesn't mean we are adapting our methods to students' personalities or learning

styles at all. It is simply dividing up approaches on the basis of what best seems to fit our instructional objectives. In short, it is the same old story of instructional convenience taking precedence over the needs of learners.

Question: Dr. Haywood, you mentioned that it would be wise to have a much closer relationship between the librarian and the teacher, but both you and Mrs. Knapp spoke about this in nebulous terms. Can you be specific on how the two might work together more closely?

Haywood: Good for you. You have just hit on one of the weaknesses of the lecture method; there is a tendency to gloss over what the listener wants to hear!

It is also a difficult question. Only a Dean would attempt to redefine roles in academia. Everyone in the educational bureaucracy not only believes he is doing a good job, but that his job is most important of all. Therefore, when specific suggestions for redefining roles and expectations within the system come up they invariably meet with a hostile reception. This is especially true of ideas that deal with implementing what I understand the Library-College to be. I have heard How-

ard Clayton remind people that this concept calls for a drastic—even radical—redefinition of many role relationships from the kindergarten level to the Ph.D. degree.

Against this background let me start the "specifics" by pointing out that for the kinds of people represented here, the obvious one would be the formation of a team including a librarian and teacher, in my case, a teacher-historian. Once established the student, the learner, finds himself in an environment where the goals, the expectations, and the outcomes of all his educational experiences are centered around, again to use Clayton's words, "an integration of skill-building in use of tools with the mastery of content." In practical terms, this means that from the first to the last day of class students are working with a bibliographic-minded subject specialist (teacher-historian) and a disciplinary-oriented media specialist (librarian) in both a formal and an informal way.

With an approach of this kind the student no longer sees the use of materials as supplementary, or "enriching"—or even helpful. Rather, he sees it as *THE COURSE*. The student becomes responsible for learn-

ing how to gather the materials which are needed for evaluative thinking. In other words, everything about the method—which is to say its mode, style, purpose, and expectations—revolve around the use of responsibly-chosen data. This is of the utmost importance, for evaluative thinking can take place only if the student has data to evaluate, which in turn depends on knowing where and how to locate information. It is a circular kind of process.

In thinking of ways to form a team one cannot wait for some committee or administrator to make the first move. Individual teachers and librarians must be the ones who take the initiative. Pragmatically, this means that the place to start is by finding a kindred soul, a fellow educator, who is willing to work with that goal in mind. I must, in all candor, confess that the teacher-librarian team is both the easiest and the most difficult "specific" I can suggest.

Another, although less revolutionary, way that teachers and librarians can work together is by jointly deciding the administrative question, "Who controls the nature of the library holdings?" In comparison to the forming of learning teams this idea may seem rather pedestrian, for it

involves less change in anyone's role expectations. Still, the question must be answered, for no one can utilize materials effectively if the resources center is not adequate. So, a second specific move toward working more closely together would be for librarians and members of each department to determine which of the "post holes" the student is to dig in.

As a third point I emphasize the importance of simply getting the history teacher and the librarian together on an informal basis. As a teacher who sees this matter from a teacher's perspective, I feel that what little initiative has so far been taken in this area has come largely from the faculty, not the librarians. In my own experience, no librarian has ever come to me and said, "What can I do to help you in your classroom?" On the contrary, except in their more general and formal announcements—such as one hears at faculty meetings or sees in public relations memos—they have appeared too engrossed in their own thing or just plain uninterested. If this is typical of what other teachers have experienced, then it is clear that few librarians and teachers have formed the kinds of partnerships I outlined above. Librarians, by and large, do not engage

in enough shoptalk with faculty. Perhaps a simple conversation between a librarian and a teacher is all that it takes to plant a germ of an idea.

Question: On the basis of what you just said it sounds to me as if the librarian ought to be on the executive committee or the curriculum planning council of all schools and colleges.

Haywood: Yes, he should, especially the curriculum committees. This, however, is only a first, and quite formal, relationship. I would like to see the contact go far beyond anything a committee setting could provide.

Question: I would like to ask Mrs. Knapp if she truly believes that educators can fashion a method that will facilitate the kind of study which Dr. Haywood has just described?

Knapp: In my opinion anything is possible. The only question is whether educators will make it happen. Fortunately, there is some cause to be optimistic, for faculties are at last buying a philosophy of education which emphasizes how to learn. As everyone knows, human beings learn through all kinds of experi-

ences, and with the aid of all kinds of media—that is, through use of large lectures, small discussions, readings, pictures, television, and so forth. So yes, I believe study of this kind is possible in the bureaucracy, but only if the library provides for all kinds of learning experiences.

Question: Mrs. Knapp, do you feel the entire educational system can adopt a program that starts with an integrated effort between faculty and librarians, and has as its goal a thorough blending of content mastery and skill-building in use of resources?

Knapp: As I said earlier, there is no question but what it CAN adopt, and even succeed with, such a program if educators will generate the will to put it across. Furthermore, I am certain this program could include all the elements that are basic to learning how to learn, just as I am sure it could facilitate the kind of transfer which enables a person to continue developing this ability after graduating from the school.

This being the case, we as teachers and librarians should get on with the job. After all, the means are at hand and the need is apparent, which means that our

failure to establish such a program is all the more inexcusable. Nor is this all. Continued failure to move in this direction can only result in even more students leaving the school with neither the will nor the skills to continue their learning. It is a somber prospect. Still there is hope, for teachers can yet devise those approaches that students themselves can adapt to the needs they are likely to face while going through life. No other method will be of much use.

Needless to say, there is more to this problem than just deciding how to teach or what media to use. Confounding the entire issue is a whole series of extraneous factors, such as grades, credits, requirements, examinations, degrees, and what-have-you. To a large extent these factors are obstacles to learning, for they regularly cause students to focus on the wrong goals at the wrong time and for the wrong reasons. While examples of this happening are easy to cite, perhaps none is more obvious than the way students speak of enrolling in a course so they can "get it out of the way."

In dealing with problems that arise in programs which call for an integrated effort between teachers and librarians one

must always remember that a person only learns to learn by learning. When this is remembered, teams can more easily focus on problem-solving instead of the various bureaucratic encumbrances that only hinder learning. Moreover, by keeping this one fact in mind both the teacher and librarian can proceed on the premise that learning is an open-ended affair involving discovery and exploration, and that as a result it is foolish to think in terms of so much coverage for everybody.

I know that what I'm proposing involves a drastic redefining of some long-established roles. However, if we know what we should be doing, and if we know what facilitates learning, and what hinders it, does not the issue then come down to the question, "Are we, or are we not, going to meet our professional responsibility?" If educators once answer this question in the affirmative they will quickly discover that it's the process of studying, rather than facts or coverage, that is important.

Question: Dr. Haywood, do I understand that you also feel as Mrs. Knapp does that method is as important as content?

Haywood: Yes, I do, for without the effective mastery of method there can be little hope of working one's way through a body of evidence or of relating skills in the use of sources to the discovery of historical truths. One needs to be able to "find one's way in a library," to use Mrs. Knapp's phrase. Let me give an example of what I have in mind. When a student finds a reference which needs verification, regardless of whether it comes from the *World Book Encyclopedia* or the *South Carolina Gazette*, he should know how to look in a dozen places for verification. Equally important is to know what is valid and what is not. In short, he must be able to use intelligently the sources once he finds them. I'm not certain but that at the beginning level the history student shouldn't be given a selected bundle of historical materials which contains sufficient divergent materials to prompt him to work through to some historical conclusions of his own. It's a kind of chicken and egg proposition. Historical mindedness, methodology, content mastery, and analytical insights all tend to run together.

I certainly don't subscribe to any adulation of method for method's sake.

The search for truth for its own sake and unshared is like studying history for its own sake; both are no more meaningful than working crossword puzzles. But there certainly can be no profitable sharing, no meaningful insights, if the method is faulty. Fortunately for history the use of the tools, the search, is stimulating and exciting; sometimes more so than the product which appears.

In this connection I am reminded of the time I was reading a book on a train when the man beside me leaned over and said, "You know, I wouldn't read that book for anything." "Oh," I said, "and why not?" "Because," he replied, "it looks like a history book." Well, his comment completely stifled what might have been an interesting conversation because it was a history book and it happened to be a fairly exciting one at that. If I had assured him it was the latest Agatha Christie, he would no doubt have accepted it and me. But apart from all this, what impressed me was the fact that here was a man who had never realized that there is a challenge, mystery, even intrigue in studying history and reading its results. In many ways the historical process is like solving a mystery. The historian, like the mystery writer,

tries to discover why people have believed, acted, and talked in certain ways. This, of course, amounts to an evaluation of man's motives and requires the same attitude of both practitioners. Simply put, both are problem solvers—both ask, "Who done it?" and then "Why?" As I read Dame Agatha it never pays to accept the first answer. Here again, the same attitude toward recorded historical events must prevail. It is for this reason that when I suggest in a lecture there were five causes of the War of 1812, I like for the student to know he might be able to find six.

Question: In the typical school setting is it possible to learn content and methodology simultaneously?

Haywood: Indeed it is! In fact, I am not certain which is the by-product of the other.

Question: I think this "package thing" you mentioned earlier worries me. You indicated that librarians should have it all ready to hand out to the student. Doesn't that abandon the students to the library once again?

Haywood: It does sound like it. But I was thinking only of the beginning student. Obviously this should not be the end,

for the purpose is only to enable a student to equip himself to move to a more sophisticated search later on. By the time they get to their junior or senior courses it would be an unacceptable technique. In a sense that is what is being done with the various "source books." And I think they are failing, so maybe I need to think the "bundle" theory through some more.

Knapp: Let me ask Dean Haywood a question. How significant in the "doing" of history is the element of selection of evidence? What I'm getting at is the wish you expressed that the librarian could provide the student with all the materials he needs, presumably on the basis of the instructor's recommendations. But doesn't the historian really engage in a sort of dialogue with his materials, deciding what evidence would be relevant to his question, reframing his question on the basis of the evidence he finds, and then looking for some more? And isn't this a crucial part of the process? Granted, the limitations of small library collections inevitably impose a serious constraint on this process; but, isn't the student robbed of an opportunity to learn if the major decision about what is likely to be relevant to his question is always

made for him by way of a prepackaged set of materials?

Haywood: I think you are absolutely right in assuming that the selection of a topic and the evidence which surrounds it is of crucial importance. And, I guess when I used the "bundle of material" expression, I had in mind only a beginning technique. I also had in mind that this would be a compromise solution based upon mass production needs of large classes. It is true that the historian is most interested in what the student does with the material he has at hand. But, obviously, if you can motivate a student to search out his own materials, what he does with the evidence will undoubtedly be superior to something that has been handed him. Your point is also good that the historian does engage in a "dialogue with his material." This is one of the reasons I think term papers are better instructional devices when they are done in a group, or at least by two people. Neophyte historians are helped in the dialogue by the absolute necessity of discussing the materials with one another in order to report something.

My other point which was not clearly made, I fear, is that many small libraries—

and particularly those in financially weak schools and colleges—can have only limited material in depth. In a sense, this restricts the student in his choice of materials. As you can see, if carried to its ultimate extension, this principle too would mean a "bundle of material." As a matter of fact, the forged document assignment you described is such a "bundle." Naturally, I would rather that the area in which the students explore, discover, and consider be on a broader level.

One thing I am fairly adamant about is the choice of topics. Freshman English teachers do better when they allow each student to choose his own theme. Historians, however, get miserable choices if they leave this entirely to the student. The real art here is to choose a topic that is fairly broad in its concepts yet requires specific details to answer. For instance, rather than asking a student to trace the background, causes, and content of the Great Reform of 1832 in England, it would be better to ask them to discuss "The Concepts of Justice in the Reform Bills of 1832." I submit that most beginning undergraduate students will not come up with these kinds of ideas for a term paper.

Question: I once heard a definition of an educated man as one who knows nothing, but does know how to find out what he needs to know, and how to judge it when he discovers it. What do you think of that definition?

Haywood: While such expressions as these are nice, I'm not sure they mean much. When someone says that an educated man knows nothing, and yet knows how to find out something, then obviously he knows a great deal. To the degree that a man knows about the techniques of discovery, and has the interest and skill to make some discoveries, he can become a stimulating person and eventually an educated one. In my view the truly educated man is one who has a rational attitude toward life generally, who recognizes the human predicament, and is willing—as well as knowledgeable about how—to contribute to the improvement of others.

Question: Dr. Haywood, since you feel there is value to the lecture method, how would you react to taping your lectures and keeping them in the library? Then you could abandon your students to the library and at the same time use the advantages inherent in the lecture.

Haywood: Every idea is worth examining, and perhaps even using in one way or another. One of the problems of teaching and being an administrator is that sometimes you do have to leave the campus, and like all history teachers I have felt the students shouldn't miss those precious pearls I was casting in their general direction. So I have tried it. But tapes leave out something. I have never been satisfied with the results.

While this "something" is hard to identify, my feeling is that it has to do with the interactions of students. In the live lecture there is always interaction. True, there may be no questions, and the lecturer may never take time for student comments, but he can still see an eyebrow go up, or a frown appear, which causes him to repeat or clarify. And this is important, for lecturing is more than just standing up and speaking out.

Tapes simply do not communicate in the way a live performance does. Taping with television can in some cases help. Yet even here there is a kind of class interaction that never takes place. Perhaps Mrs. Knapp has better luck in lecturing via recorder.

Knapp: On the contrary. While I lecture badly when "live," on tape I am noth-

ing short of deadly. I rarely tape anything.

Question: Do you not feel that the many new devices—particularly in the field of audiovisual materials—which are now available to the teacher have pertinence to your own teaching?

Knapp: In most ways they have a great deal of pertinence, but insofar as one-way presentations are concerned I do not fare well when putting them to use. Nor do many other teachers have much success at communicating educational ideas to large numbers of people via lectures which are on tape recorders. This is an interesting phenomenon, for even though research experts have not been able to explain why, it is obvious that there is a serious loss in communication when a teacher tries to can his lectures. Even videotape recordings are seldom helpful in this regard. Admittedly, there are times when some transcriptions of one-way presentations are effective. Recordings of poetry by well-known personalities, for instance, can be more effective than reading to one's self, or even having the instructor read a poem. In the main, however, locally-made recordings of lec-

tures, criticisms, and discussions fail to communicate with maximum effectiveness.

Question: How can we get rid of obstacles to personalized learning when the accreditation agencies are able to impose all kinds of standardized procedures on the local school?

Knapp: This is another one of those bureaucratic entanglements which every educator should, and must, try to resist. It is difficult to do, but again it is a question of whether a person is going to go along or meet his professional responsibility by working for individual rather than packaged, or standardized, results.

Haywood: Regrettably, I'm not much help here beyond echoing the sentiment that as educators we can try to resist the bureaucratic entanglements which stand as obstacles to personalized learning when accreditation agencies enforce standardized procedures on the local school. Few schools and fewer individuals have been successful.

But let me go back to the question of audiovisual aids. My negative feelings relate only to taped lectures as a substitute for the live lecturer. We have only begun to tap the potential of TV. Other electronic

gadgets will become far more than just that in the future. They will, in fact, become a part of the arsenal of the Library-College.

Question: Since students—even young students in the elementary school—now have such learning tools as periodicals, television sets, and phonograph records available in their own living rooms at home, is it not reasonable to suppose that when these students enter higher education they will refuse to tolerate professors who continue with nothing but lectures, textbooks, and tests? If elementary and secondary school educators are doing everything the new standards require and the librarians have trained them as they claim, when these students arrive on campus won't both the college librarians and teachers have their hands full? I'm wondering if there is something we should be doing to lessen the shock for our faculty and help them weather the crisis they will have to face.

Haywood: While there is a point to all this I am still skeptical. It is true that high school students who are now coming to college have a different kind of preparation. We hear that it is better, but whether this is true or not is still an open

question. Certainly they are more visually oriented than students in the past, but this same orientation may mean that they will need more sweetening and entertainment in strictly lecture classes. But whatever the case, I feel that the majority will be just as ignorant of history, though presumably just as interested in the truth, as other generations of young people have been. Hopefully, they will have more skill at using libraries. If this does prove to be the case the Library-College team of bibliographic-oriented subject specialist and disciplinary-minded librarian should have a better chance to help them develop in individual ways. In return, the student should have more background for "doing" some history.

Appendix

A Selected Bibliography

- Barzun, Jacques. *Teacher In America*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1954.
- Bird, Caroline. "Where College Fails Us." *Signature* 10 (June, 1975): 60.
- Bird, Merle. "Pupils' Aim: Historical Vignettes." *The Topeka State Journal* (January 22, 1976): 1.
- Boorstin, Daniel Joseph. *Democracy and Its Discontents; Reflections on Everyday America*. New York: Random House, 1974.
- Busse, Norman L. "Revealed: How Classroom Teachers Use Media." *Audiovisual Instruction* 21 (October, 1976): 45.
- Clayton, Howard. "What Is This Library-College Business?" *Learning Today* 9 (Summer-Fall, 1976): 36-71.
- Cummings, Susan N. *Communication For Education*. Scranton: Intext Educational Publishers, 1971.

- Dunne, Finley Peter. *Dissertations by Mr. Dooley*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1906.
- Gordon, Jesse E. *Personality and Behavior*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.
- Gunselman, Marshall. "Learning By Doing With Media." *Learning Today* 6 (Winter, 1973): 41-47.
- Hantula, James. "The New 'Irreducible Content' of American History." *Organization of American Historians Newsletter* 5 (July, 1977): 7.
- Haywood, C. Robert. "Old, Bold Librarians." *Library-College Journal* 1 (Summer, 1968): 11-14.
- Haywood, C. Robert. "The Teacher and the Library-Teacher." *Liberal Education* 55 (May, 1969): 288-295.
- Hexter, J. H. "Doing History." *Commentary* 51 (June, 1971): 53-62.
- "History Courses Losing Students." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 9 (September 23, 1974): 7.
- Humphrey, David C., and McCreary, Eugene C. "Evaluating the Teaching of History." *Liberal Education* 56 (December, 1970): 519-531.
- Knapp, Patricia. *College Teaching and the College Library*. American College and Research Libraries Monograph No. 23. Chicago: American Library Association, 1959.
- Knapp, Patricia. *The Monteith College Library Experiment*. New York: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1966.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1954.
- Marsh, Richard R. "Historical Evidence and Anal-

- ysis: An Introduction." *Learning Today* 4 (Fall, 1971): 28-36.
- Morris, Alvin. "Accent on Learning." *Learning Today* 5 (Winter, 1972): 32-39.
- Nelson, Murry R., and Singleton, H. Wells. "Using Oral History in the Social Studies Classroom." *The Clearing House* 49 (October, 1975): 89-93.
- Newton, Richard F. "Oral History: Using the School as an Historical Institution." *The Clearing House* 48 (October, 1973): 76-77.
- Postlethwait, Samuel N. "Time for Microcourses?" *Library-College Journal* 2 (Winter, 1969): 24-29.
- Postlethwait, Samuel N., and Hurst, Robert N. "Minicourses; Focusing on the Individual and His Learning." *Library-College Journal* 4 (Winter, 1971): 16-24.
- Robinson, Thomas E. *The Teacher: Key to Library Centered Instruction*. Norman, OK: The Library-College Associates, Inc., 1976.
- Rogers, Carl. *Freedom To Learn*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Co., 1969.
- Sarasohn, David. "Zero Historian Growth." *Harper's Magazine* 251 (July, 1975): 92.
- Schuster, Sister Marie. *The Library-Centered Approach to Learning*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications, 1977.
- Shafer, Boyd C. "The Study of History in the United States; Some Affirmations and Some Doubts." *A.A.U.P. Bulletin* 50 (September, 1964): 232-240.
- Sheehan, Helen Beebe. "Implementing the Library-College Idea." *Learning Today* 1 (Summer, 1968): 15-19.

- Sheehan, Helen Beebe. "The Student and the Library-College." *Learning Today* 9 (Spring, 1976): 30-45.
- Sheppard, Sandra. "Selling the Library-College." *Library-College Experimenter* 2 (May, 1976): 10-14.
- Shermis, Samuel. "Six Myths Which Delude History Teachers." *Phi Delta Kappan* 49 (September, 1967): 9-12.
- Shores, Louis. *The Generic Book; What It Is and How It Works*. Norman, OK: The Library-College Associates, Inc., 1977.
- Shores, Louis. "The Junior College Impact on Academic Librarianship." *College and Research Libraries* 30 (May, 1969): 214-221.
- Siepmann, Charles. "The Ubiquitous and the Absurd." *Learning Today* 6 (Winter, 1973): 33-40.
- Skinner, B. F. *The Technology of Teaching*. New York: Meredith Corporation, Inc., 1968.
- Taylor, Harold. *Students Without Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1972.
- "1066, 1492, and Student 49631." *N.E.A. Journal* 55 (October, 1966): 22-23.
- Weeks, Margaret L. "They're Going on for Ph.D.'s Despite the Overcrowded Field." *University of North Carolina Alumni Review* 15 (May, 1977): 8-10.
- Wesley, Edgar Bruce. "Let's Abolish History Courses." *Phi Delta Kappan* 49 (September, 1967): 3-8.